THE Font-Guard Routed:

OR,

A brief ANSWER to a Book written by *Thomas Hall*, ſuperſcribed with this Title, *The Font Guarded with* 20. *Arguments*: Therein endeavouring to prove the lawfulneſs of *Infant-Baptiſm*.

WHEREIN

His Arguments are examined, and being weighed in the ballance of the Sanctuary, are found too light. The moſt conſiderable of Mr. *Baxters* Arguments for *Infant-Baptiſm*, being produced by *Tho. Hall*, are here anſwered likewiſe.

To which is added,

A Word of Reply to *Tho. Halls* Word to *Collier*. And another to *John Feriby's* Appendix, called *The Pulpit-Guard Relieved*.

With an *Anſwer to Richard Sanders's* pretended *Balm to heal Religious Wounds*; in anſwer to the *Pulpit-Guard Routed*.

With an humble Repreſentation of ſome few *Propoſals* to the *Honorable Committee* appointed by the *Parliament* for *Propagation of the Goſpel*.

Written by *Tho. Collier*.

If ye love me, keep my commandments. Joh. 14. 15.
If ye continue in my word, then are ye my Diſciples indeed. Joh. 8. 31.

LONDON,
Printed for the Author, and are to be ſold by *Giles Calvert*, at the *Black-Spread-Eagle* neer the Weſt-end of *Pauls*. 1652.

BODLEIANA · BIBLIOTHECA

The Epistle to the Reader.

Reader,

I Having so suddenly, and almost unexpectedly brought forth this Treatise to publique view, Plainness and brevity thou mayst find in it, though but little of that excellencie which mans wisdom teacheth; yet something of the truth of Jesus mayst thou find there, in the plain evidence of the Spirit and power of truth. And whereas thou seest many differences in the world about the worship of God, it behoves thee so much the more to querie after it; for it is the duty of those who have an interest in Christ, to do his will: If ye love me, saith Christ, keep my commandments, Joh. 14.15. and that is the way to attain an increase in the knowledge of the will of God, viz. a doing of what we know, Joh.7 17.

I have here presented to thy view several Replies unto several Men and Things. First to the Font-guarded; wherein you have, gathered up all the Arguments of former Writers, especially Mr. Baxters, and drawn into 20 Arguments. To all which I have given a brief Reply; and although brief, yet I question not but with such plainness and clearness, as that he that runs may read: and in it through mercy thou mayst come to see the clear difference between Moses and Christ, the Covenant of the Law and the Covenant of the Gospel: the ordinances, ministry and worships of the one, and of the other: and because God hath made me publike in the profession of his truth, I judge my self bound in conscience, and duty to Jesus Christ, to vindicate that truth I profess: every command and truth of Jesus being, to a lover of the truth, more precious then that of gold, and although hitherunto I have and may still expect to pass through many reproaches for the sake of Christ, through good and bad report; yet I weigh it not; none of these things trouble me; it was the portion of Christ himself; and if they called the master of the house Beelzebub, what will they not do to the servant? I trust, that notwithstanding the rudeness and rage of those men who seek themselves, yet God hath hitherto so kept and carried me, that I may say truly, I have endeavoured to keep a Conscience void of offence both before God and men. And as to those Principles of Truth by me owned, although judged by men, yet my

judgement is with the Lord, and he knows the way of his People, but the way of the wicked shall perish. Though I pass under the censure of Tho. Hall, *whom nothing but Fire and Fagot can satisfie, and under the ignominious reproaches of* Feriby, Sanders, *and a thousand more, yet none of these things trouble me; and let none think that I am besides my self, because I thus profess and write: for if I am it is to the Lord, and for your sakes, for whom my desire is, that you may be made partaker of the truth, and that as it is in* Jesus; not after the will of men, but of God. *I have presented to thy consideration these two things. First, the insufficiency of all those grounds produced for Infant-Baptism, wherein its weakness and inconsistency with the Gospel will appear; and the continued practice of the baptizing of Believers cleared and vindicated.*

2. *A brief Reply to* John Feriby, *and* Richard Sanders: *wherein you may finde a farther confirmation of the truth asserted in the* Pulpit-Guard Routed, *viz. the lawfulness of the Preaching of Gifted Brethren.*

I have likewise three things to desire of the Reader.

1. *To read and judge: Read, and consider what thou readest; for I have endeavoured to compose much in few words, and that because I judged it to be for thy profit, large Discourses being sometimes not so usefull: therefore, I say, be content to spare a little time to consider, and contemplate upon what thou readest, and happily thou mayest come to see all those strong Guards broken and dispersed, as the morning dew before the Sun.*

2. *Read with patience; and be not troubled at that which may seem to thee to be harsh language, or contrary to thy understanding: and this I assure thee, considering the Spirits of those men with whom I have had to deal, I have passed through with as much moderation as possibly I could, without betraying the Cause; and giving but a word of reproof to an insulting adversary.*

3. *Read and judge impartially; lean not to the right hand or to the left, for affection sake, but desire the Lord, from an impartial unbyast heart, to lead thee into the truth, resolve not to follow the traditions of men or Churches, but the Written Word of Truth, which is able to give thee direction as a rule of life through the blessing of the Spirit of Jesus, and to make the man of God perfect, throughly furnishing him to every good work.*

Tho. Collier.

THE Font-Guard Routed.

SIR,

IT S faln to my lot once more to encounter with you; and why to me more then to others? because not only the Truth of Jesus, his Honour, and his servants in the profession of it, lieth at stake; but my self likewise in a special manner being not only concerned in the case in hand, but likewise being deeply aspersed by your Libellous Tongue and Pen in your succeeding word to one *Collier*, to which I shall reply in its time and place. But Sir, by the way, it seems you are become an absolute Souldier, a grand Captain, Leader. But whats the work? To guard *Pulpits* and *Fonts* forsooth. I suppose you'l be cautious of suffering much in defence of your Cause; if you had intended it, you would not have set your guards about that which none intends to take from you that I know of: But is it truth in good earnest that your *Font* is affronted?

1. I wonder you had not had more wisdom and forecast in you at first, and have set your Guard round about your Kirks, so one might have served for the whole, and have saved you much labour and expence of time? but I suppose your wisdom lay in this; You guarded the *Pulpit* first, that so being routed there, you might have a fair retreat to the holy *Font*; and when routed there you might sound another retreat, but whither I know not, unless to the high Altar, *viz.* the Communion Table (so called) or into the Belfrey, to secure the

holy baptized Bels; In Pope *Johns* time the 14. began the vile superstition of baptizing Bels; *Simpsons* History of the Church, *Cent.* 10. Or to take the Church doors, &c. But whither am I wandring? I say no more of this, but leave my namesake *Tom* to his own choice.

2. I wonder that a wise man, as *Tho. Hall*, should have so little wit, or so much idle time, to set up such a strong guard in defence of that which none intends to take from him; we baptize in *Rivers*, not in *Fonts*; we do not intend to take them from you; no, we know not what to do with them, unless &c.

But 3. Did you ever read in Scripture of the *Font*, or of baptizing in the *Font*? I know you have not. I remember I have read in the Popish Histories of the holy *Fons*, in the first institution of Infants baptism; from thence you had both, as in its time and place I shall let you see.

Now to your Arguments, for that is it I intend to fall upon, letting pass all other things; for if I rout you there, as I doubt not in the strength of *Jehovah*, whom I serve in my spirit, but that I shall rout you in all your twenty Arguments; so the Commands of Christ, and practise of the Apostles may stand clear before the sons of men; and the Churches practise in baptizing Believers vindicated, in opposition to all gainsayers. Now to your first Argument, *Page* 8.

From the Covenant of grace which God made with the Faithfull and their Seed; they are confederates say you, [illegible] together in the Covenant of God, &c.

Your first Argument is this, *Page* 9.

To whomsoever the Covenant it self belongs, to them also belongs the seal of the Covenant.
But the Covenant belongs to Believers and their Children.
Ergo, *The seal of the Covenant belongs to them also.*

I answer: First, your *Minor* is denyed, That Children of Believers are in the Covenant of grace; and here lies the ground of your miscarriage, ignorance, and error in this particular. We will therefore come first to consider the Covenant it self, which is the foundation on which you stand, *Gen.* 17. 7, 10, 11. This Covenant it self is wholly outward, and it consists of two parts: the one on Gods part to be performed, the other on *Abrahams* and his childrens part.

That

That on Gods is in *ver.* 7, 8. *I will be a God to thee, and to thy ſeed after thee; and I will give unto thee, and to thy ſeed after thee the Land of thy ſojourning, all the Land of Canaan for an everlaſting poſſeſſion, and will be their God,* This Covenant is outward, and conſiſts of an outward promiſe, *The Land of Canaan, &c.* and is not in it ſelf the everlaſting Covenant of grace: Its true, there is grace in this Covenant, yet it is not the Covenant of grace; there is grace in this, for it is grace for God declaratively to be a God to a People. And ſecondly, there was the everlaſting grace included typically in this Covenant, for it relates in the myſterie unto Chriſt, as all outward Covenants, Services, and the Land of Canaan it ſelf did, *Gal* 3.6 *Col.* 2.17. *Heb.* 4. from *ver.* 3. to the 8. That it was an outward Covenant, will appear. 1. The thing promiſed in the Covenant was outward *i. e.* The Land of Canaan.

Object. *He promiſed to be a God unto them in an everlaſting Covenant.*

Anſw. 1. This was a promiſe in an outward Covenant, as will appear *Iſa* 10.22,23. compared with *Rom.* 9.29. *Though the Children of Iſrael be as the ſand of the ſea, yet a remnant of them ſhall be ſaved:* Now if God had been a God unto them in the Covenant of grace, they muſt have been all ſaved, and have continued in that Covenant unto this day; but it being but an outward and typical Covenant, relating to Chriſt the antitype and ſubſtance; when Chriſt was come, that Covenant was diſſolved into Chriſt, and is given forth upon the true ſpiritual account, to the ſpiritual ſeed, *Gal.* 3.16. with 29.

2. Its ſaid to be *an everlaſting Covenant*, either 1. becauſe it was to continue its appointed time, ſo called Everlaſting, as uſually the old Teſtament Ordinances were: ſo God promiſed in this Covenant to give the Land of Canaan for an everlaſting poſſeſſion: yet they are, and have been many hundreds of years turned out of it; and if they had not, yet that could but have been a poſſeſſion for them in their generations till the end of the world. But the Covenant of grace reaches to eternity, without end, *Pſal.* 103.17. Hence the Prieſthood of the Law was called an everlaſting Prieſthood, *Exod.* 40.15. *Num.* 25. 13. Or ſecondly, its called Everlaſting, upon the account of Chriſt, who was the ſubſtance, and the Covenant it ſelf when he came, ending all other Covenants and Services, *Iſa* 42.6. So *Davids* Kingdom was ſaid to be Everlaſting, upon the account of Chriſt, who was, and is the true ſpiritual King, of whom *David* was a type. 2 *Sam.* 7.16. *Pſ.* 89. 35,36. compared with *Ezek.* 37.24,25. *David* was dead long be-

fore; yet *David*, viz. *Christ*, must be their *King for ever*. Thus it appears first from the Covenant it self on Gods part, that it was not the Covenant of grace, though grace was darkly and typically included in it, only the enlightened renewed soul saw into it, and partaked of Christ the substance.

But secondly, it will appear likewise if we consider the second part of the Covenant on *Abraham* and his childrens part: *Every man-child shall be circumcised at eight dayes old*, v. 10, 11, 12. Here is an external obedience suitable to an external covenant: God promiseth the land of *Canaan*; in lieu of this they must be circumcised, which shall be a sign of their obedience, and to God of his Covenant, as the Rain bow in another case.

2. The Covenant being thus considered, it followeth, that notwithstanding this Covenant was to *Abraham* and his seed natural, yet it is not to Believers now and their seed natural. This denies your *Minor*, and this Scripture produced by you doth not prove it. Your other Scripture *Act.* 2. 39. I shall answer in its place, when I come to your Argument drawn from it. And whereas you say, *That there are some Infants in the Covenant of grace*, I deny it positively that there are Infants in the Covenant of grace upon your account, *viz.* the account of nature, because born of believing parents; all fleshly boasting being taken away, *Rom.* 3. 27. As the Covenant to *Abraham* and his seed was outward and typical; so the Covenant of Christ, or Christ the Covenant is to the spiritual seed, and that only: those who are of the faith of *Abraham*, who *do the works of Abraham*, they, and they only are the seed of *Abraham*, *Joh.* 8. 39. *He is not a Jew that is one outwardly, but he is a Jew that is one inwardly*, *Rom.* 2. 28, 29. where as the outward Covenant, so the natural seed are cut off, and only the spiritual stands. And whereas you say, there is an outward being in this Covenant, &c. *Ishmael* was circumcised: I say so too; for in it self it was wholly outward; this and all other Covenants and services were outward and typical, except the first promise *Gen.* 3. The Covenant of grace now in the dayes of Christ, is wholly spiritual. Those then that were enlightened, which were but few, saw and enjoyed the substance in the shadow and form; We first the substance, and with it the form: They were first brought by works to Christ; we first to Christ, and then to works as fruits of faith.

And whereas you conclude Baptism to be *a Seal of the Covenant of Grace*, you are as much besides the truth in this, as in the Covenant it

self

ſelf. Becauſe you have heard others ſay it, therefore you affirm it too, as children uſe to ſpeak by tradition: but where is your Scripture for it? Did you ever read of any New-Teſtament ſeal, beſides the Spirit of Chriſt? *Epheſ.* 1.13. *ch.* 4.30. But I ſuppoſe becauſe that it's ſaid *Rom.* 4.11. that *Abraham received the ſign of Circumciſion, a ſeal of the righteouſneſs of his faith* which he had before he was circumciſed, that therefore *Baptiſm is a ſeal of the Covenant of grace*: Oh groſs miſtake! *Abraham* believed God when he firſt promiſed him the land of *Canaan*, and commanded him to forſake all and go into it, and that he would keep him and bleſs him, *Gen.* 12. Here *Abraham* believed God, and obeyed, and went out *not knowing whither*; and *v.* 17. God gave him Circumciſion a ſign and ſeal to confirm his faith, which he had before in this promiſe. And as Circumciſion was given a ſeal of *Abrahams* faith in Gods promiſing him the land of *Canaan*; ſo the Spirt of grace is the ſeal of faith to every believer of his intereſt in the ſpiritual land, the ſubſtance of the outward, the Lord Jeſus. So you are loſt both in Covenant, in Seal, in the Subjects of the Covenant and all.

You mention *Gal.* 4.28. I ſay, upon the Goſpel-account its truth, as *Iſaac* was heir to that Covenant, ſo all true believers are heirs of the true promiſe, and none elſe. Whereas you ſay *pag.* 11. in way of anſwer to an objection, *That theirs is old, and ended &c.* you anſwer, *That to make that old, none but carnal Anabaptiſts will do it.* Your mouth is wide, but let it paſs. I anſwer, To make that Covenant which was of an outward land, the ſame as ours which is of a ſpiritual land; to bring in the natural ſeed upon that account, when it is only to the ſpiritual ſeed, none but a carnal and blind generation of men dare to do. Chriſt ſaith, *Joh.* 4. 24 *God is a Spirit, and they that worſhip him muſt worſhip in ſpirit and in truth, and ſuch the Father ſeeks to worſhip him.* Jeſus Chriſt came forth from the Father for that end, that he might gain a ſpiritual people to worſhip: but your great work is to get in a natural people, a carnal people, the fleſhly ſeed; ſo contradicting the end of God in giving Chriſt: upholding the Covenant made with *Abraham* and *Moſes*; ſo denying Chriſt to be come in the fleſh: I will not ſay, at preſent, for your own ends and intereſts.

The force of your firſt Argument being thus untwiſted, and its weakneſs and invalidity laid open, I need not trace you in your Parallels: what I have already written, puts an end to your Parallels, as far

far as you imagine they tend to uphold the ſtrength of your Arguments. I ſhall preſent another Parallel from what I have declared, leaving it to the judgment of the judicious Reader to conſider.

1. The Covenant made with *Abraham* was an outward covenant, and promiſe of the Land of *Canaan*. *Gen.*17.10, 11, 12.
2. That was made with *Abraham* and his natural ſeed, *Gen.*17. 7, 8.
3. Circumciſion was the ſeal of that Covenant, *Rom.*4.11.
4. That was a Covenant that many, moſt of thoſe in it, miſſed of eternal life, *Rom.*2.27.
5. That was a Covenant that might be broken, and had an end; as all types end when the ſubſtance comes.

1. *Ours is a ſpiritual Covenant, and promiſe of & in Jeſus Chriſt the true ſpiritual Land of reſt,* Heb 4. 4. to 8.
2. *Ours is a Covenant made with Chriſt and all his ſpirstual ſeed,* Iſa 59.21. Gal. 3.29.
3. *But the Spirit of grace is the ſeal of our covenant,* Eph. 1. 13. 4. 30.
4. *Ours is a covenant ſure & ſtedfaſt, eternal, everlaſting to thoſe once truly in it,* Iſa. 55. 3. Jer. 31. 31. 32. Joh 10.28, 9.
5. *Ours is a Covenant that cannot be broken, nor ſhall ever have an end, being the ſubſtance it ſelf of the type.*

Now to your ſecond Argument from Circumciſion.

The ſecond Argument, p.13.

Such as were circumciſed under the Law, may be baptized under the Goſpel.

But the Jews with their Infants were circumciſed under the Law.

Ergo, *Chriſtians and their Infants may be baptized under the Goſpel.*

You confeſs that your *Major* is queſtioned, as well it may be ſo: I could give you ſeveral Arguments which you would not like, as well grounded as this of yours; but I forbear. For proof of your *Major*,

1. You ſay, *They are under the ſame Covenant.* That is denied, and raſed in my Anſwer to your former argument: It is neither the ſame Covenant, nor the ſame ſeal; an outward ſeal to an outward Covenant, an inward ſeal to an inward Covenant.

2 You

2. You say, *There is the same reason for the one as for the other: our children are born in original sin as well as theirs, & have the same need of the seal.* Oh unimaginable blindness! was Circumcision or Baptism either ever given to seal up the pardon of original sin? If it was, then it must be pardoned, or not pardoned: if pardoned, then sure; else it is but the putting a seal to a blank. But the truth is, they were never given either of them upon that account, or for that end, to seal up the pardon of original sin. And whereas you say there is the same reason for the one as for the other, it is denied; for the command of God is the reason of the one and of the other; God commanded Infants to be circumcised, he hath commanded Believers to be baptized; and 'tis reason that he should be obeyed as in the first, so in the second: it's an unreasonable and wicked thing to contradict by contrary actions the commands of Christ.

3. You say, *If Baptism succeed in the place of Circumcision, then Baptism belongs to those to whom Circumcision did belong. But Baptism doth succeed in the place of Circumcision.* Ergo, *&c.* I answer, your *Minor* is denied. 1. There is no Scripture that saith that Baptism was ordained in the place of *Circumcision*; it's your own invention, never mentioned by the Apostles of Christ. The Scriptures you mention, *Act.*2.38,39. *Col.*2.11,12. have not the least hint in them to the thing in hand, and are abundantly abused and wrested to that for which they were never intended, as will appear. 2. You confess that *Baptism was in force before Circumcision was abolished.* Circumcision and Baptism stood both in force by a Law for some years, at least 3 or 4 years. Now if Baptism had come in the room of Circumcision, then Circumcision must have ceased when Baptism came: But Circumcision did not cease when Baptism came; Therefore Baptism came not in the room of it. If it be objected, that *Paul* circumcised *Timothy* after the ascension of Christ; I answer, that was because of the *Jewes* for their weakness: but it was in being by the Law of God untill the death of Christ. So then I reason thus: That which put an end to Circumcision, came in the room of Circumcision; but Christ put an end to Circumcision, therefore he is come in the room of Circumcision. That it was Christ, and not Baptism that put an end to Circumcision, is cleer, *Rom.*10.4. *Gal.*5.2,3. So that Baptism did not put an end to Circumcision, but Christ did; therefore Baptism came not in the room of Circumcision. 3. It could not come in the room of Circumcision to them that never had Circumcision: but women were

never

never circumciſed, the Gentiles were never circumciſed; and it could not come in the room of Circumciſion to thoſe which never were circumciſed. But you will ſay that women were virtually circumciſed in the men, &c. And why are they not baptized virtually in the men too? if you will take your rule from Circumciſion, let them be baptized in the men too. 4. There is no parity, but a diſparity between Baptiſm and Circumciſion, as your ſelf in ſome things have noted. 1. In the action, 2. in the time, 3. in the ſubject, 4. in the end. Firſt, in the action; that was the cutting of the foreskin of the fleſh, which occaſioned blood; this of Baptiſm a dipping into or under water. Secondly, for the time; that was to be done at eight dayes old, this of Baptiſm when the party deſireth it, profeſſing faith and repentance to the ſatisfying of the Church, be when it will. Thirdly, for the ſubject; that was the Male only, this of Baptiſm is to be adminiſtred on both men and women, profeſſing faith in our Lord Jeſus, and repentance towards God. Fourthly, for the end, that is far wide, as will appear in this enſuing Parallel.

1. Circumciſion ſet forth Chriſt to come.	1. *Baptiſm declares Chriſt already come.*
2. Circumciſion repreſented the circumciſion of the heart, the cutting off of ſin and ſelf, &c.	2. *Baptiſm declares the waſhing away of the guilt of ſin and death, and burial with Jeſus Chriſt.*
3. That was a ſeal of *Abrahams* faith.	3. *Baptiſm is no ſeal, but the Spirit of Chriſt.*

Theſe things conſidered, there is neither probability, reaſon, or Scripture for the coming of Baptiſm in the room of Circumciſion: Firſt, there is no Scripture for it: when falſe Apoſtles went about to bring in Circumciſion, *Act.* 15. 10. *Gal.* 1. the Apoſtle never mentions Baptiſm at all; if it had come in the room of Circumciſion, they might eaſily have ſtopped their mouths with this; You have Baptiſm in the room of it, what need you trouble your ſelves ſo much? But they never made uſe of this as an anſwer; therefore its evident that it came not in the room of it. 2. It was in being together. 3. It could not be ſo to them that were never circumciſed. And 4. there being no parity between them, I adde 5. If you will have it in the room of ſomething, why might it not come in the room of thoſe Legal waſhings that were amongſt the Jews, as well as in the room

of

of Circumciſion? there is a parity in the one, and likelier in the end too, but none in the other; their Religion *viz.* the *Jews*, conſiſted in divers waſhings, *Heb.*9.10. ſo that if you muſt of neceſſity have it to come in the room of any thing, why not in the room of thoſe waſhings? Yet I do not believe that it came in the room of this or any other legal Ordinance; but that God gave what Ordinances he pleaſed to that miniſtration, and Jeſus Chriſt gave what Ordinances he pleaſed to this miniſtration: not one Ordinance putting out the other; but Chriſt being the end of all, gives out new upon his own account.

But ſecondly, put caſe what you ſay were truth, that it were come in the room of Circumciſion, which can never be proved either from Scripture or reaſon; yet what will this help you? We are, or profeſs our ſelves to be Chriſts ſervants: then hearken to him, and obey his voice; receive the Law from his mouth, for he is the Meſſenger of the Lord of Hoſts. Let Chriſt be King; give but ſo much honour to him as to inform you who is to be baptized, and the time when it is to be done, & the manner how, and the controverſie will be ſoon ended. The truth of the buſineſs being thus conſidered, your Aſſertion and your Parallels I leave to the conſideration of the underſtanding Reader, and ſo purſue you to your third Argument.

The third Argument.

Where there is a command for a thing never yet countermanded or forbidden, there that thing is ſtill in force.
But there is a command for ſigning the Infants of believers, never yet countermanded or forbidden.
Ergo, *It is ſtill in force.*

This Argument is eaſily anſwered, only it's ſtated confuſedly; if you intend by the command for ſigning Believers children, that of Circumciſion, as I ſuppoſe you do, then I think that is repealed and forbidden, for the Apoſtle ſaith to the *Galatians*, that if they be *circumciſed, Chriſt ſhall profit them nothing at all.* And if you deny this truth, we may well take the Apoſtles advice, *Phil.*3. *Beware of the conciſion; for we are the Circumciſion, who worſhip God in the Spirit, &c.* If you by the ſign intend Baptiſm, you had done well to ſhew where it was commanded to Infants; and if nowhere commanded, then no need of

repealing or *forbidding*. If you intend that Baptiſm was commanded in Circumciſion, that hath been anſwered already; and it is but a whimſie of your own head, there hath not been any Scripture yet produced for the confirmation of it, nor ever is like to be: all you ſay in this, is but the ſubſtance of what you have ſaid already; you dance about in a line, and are gotten no further yet then in your former Arguments; it's juſt the old Proverb, *A great cry, and a little wooll.* Truly, if you did know and love the Lord Jeſus, you could not, you would not dare to go back to lay the foundation of Goſpel ordinances in Legal inſtitutions; but you would look to Chriſt, and hearken what he hath ſaid; and believe it, every one that refuſeth to look to him, ſhall be cut off from among his people, *Act.*3.22,23.

You ſay, *Let any man ſhew if he can, when, where, and how this priviledge was abrogated.* I anſwer, it was abrogated and repealed in Chriſt: that as all the Services, Ceremonies, Covenants, *Canaan*, Natural ſeed, and all was typical; ſo Chriſt is the body and ſubſtance of all theſe ſervices, ceremonies, &c. and the ſpiritual people, believers, are the ſubſtance typed out in the natural ſeed. So that as the natural ſeed were accounted for the ſeed, that is repealed; *Joh.*8.39,44. with *Rom.*2.28, 29. and only the ſpiritual are accounted for the ſeed.

You talk much of priviledge, as if baptizing of Infants were ſuch a priviledge to them. I anſwer, 1. Our priviledges do not conſiſt in externals; but as the Covenant was made with the ſpiritual ſeed, ſo the priviledges of the Covenant are ſuitable to it; ſee *Heb.*8. from the 6. verſe to the end. And truly it bewrayes abundance of ignorance in thoſe that cry out ſo much about priviledge, as if the priviledge of the Covenant of grace conſiſted ſo much in outſide things. What priviledge it was to the *Jews* to be circumciſed, I know not, I mean to thoſe who were never circumciſed in their hearts; or what priviledge it is to Infants to be baptized, I wonder, unleſs you will make it a priviledge to be in the form without the power, and ſo to make ſouls think themſelves Chriſtians when they are none, ſo deceiving and deluding them. Certainly this will be but a ſad priviledge one day, when both teachers and raught muſt give an account together. I could ſometimes be freely willing to part even with tears of blood, in ſight and ſenſe of thoſe many thouſands, yea millions of ſouls deeply deluded with pretended priviledges, who think themſelves in a good condition, and in a moment go down to hell. *For the wicked muſt be turned into hell, and all thoſe who forget God.* And *the Leaders of the people cauſe*

cauſe them to erre, and they that are led of them are deſtroyed, Iſa.9.16. Is it not much better, more ſafe, and an act of faithfulneſs for parents to deal faithfully with their children, and let them know that they are not in the Covenant of grace, but that by nature they are children of wrath as well as others, that ſo they may through mercy come to the ſight of their natural condition, and their need of Chriſt; rather then to delude them with toyes and fancies, meer imaginations of the fleſhly mind vainly puffed up? Oh the Lord will make you know one day what it is thus to lift up your ſelves in fleſhly boaſting, and to make a noſe of wax of the Covenant of grace, turn it which way you pleaſe, in one day, and out another. 1. Believers children in; 2. All profeſſing Chriſt in, though never ſo wicked; 3. Baſtards in, all in, and all as ſoon and as well as any. (See *pag.*5.) I muſt tell you, and that from the Lord, you will have a ſad account to give to the Lord one day, if mercy prevent not, for your abuſing the Covenant of grace, and thruſting a fleſhly generation upon the Lord, when he is ſeeking a ſpiritual, a holy ſeed to worſhip him: and I would have you to know, that thoſe you ſo often, and with ſo much contempt and reproach term *Anabaptiſts*, are not ſo *ſimple* as you would perſwade the world to believe; they are able through mercy to ſee into your forgeries and deluſions, and to diſcover them too in a meaſure; and to diſtinguiſh between Law and Goſpel, Covenant and Covenant, not confounding things together, *ſo denying Chriſt to be come in the fleſh.*

I ſhall in a word give you the difference. The Covenant of the Law, either that with *Abraham* or with *Moſes*, was a Covenant without them, and the myſterie or ſubſtance was hid from all (though all was in it) unleſs thoſe few taught of God: The Covenant of the Goſpel is wholly ſpiritual, and none are in it but the ſpiritual ſeed, *viz.* true believers; though hypocrites may come in to the outward profeſſion, yet they have nothing to do to be there, for there is no outſide in the Covenant of grace. That which you call the outward Covenant, is but the outward profeſſion of the inviſible grace, and that is proper only to thoſe who are in it: & although the Diſciples did, and we may admit thoſe that may prove hypocrites; yet neither did they, nor may we admit any by baptiſm into the viſible profeſſion of the inviſible grace, but thoſe we judge by the rule of truth in this particular to have true faith; and if any come in that have it not, to their own peril it will be. Therefore if this be truth, as I am ſure it is, what account will thoſe give to the Lord, who bring in the natural ſeed to the profeſſion

of the ſpiritual Covenant, and ſo make them hypocrites: A day will come, *when the ſinners in Sion ſhall be afraid, and fearfulneſs ſhall ſurpriſe the hypocrite*, Iſa. 33. So I conclude, that Infants are not in the Covenant of grace, nor were ever commanded to be baptized, therefore have no right unto it.

The fourth Argument.

Chriſtians ought to be baptized.
But Infants of Chriſtians are Chriſtians.
Ergo, *They ought to be baptized.*

Anſw. 1. If this Argument were truth, it were a very eaſie thing to be a Chriſtian. Born Chriſtians by nature! no need of Chriſt, the Goſpel, Spirit, Regeneration, any thing; it makes void all the whole Goſpel of grace and peace; a doctrine of Devils indeed: Do you not remember that *Paul* ſaith, *If any man preach any other Goſpel then what he had preached, he ſhould be accurſed*, Gal. 1. But you have found out another Goſpel, Chriſtians by the natural generation and birth; Curſed be all ſuch ſoul-deceiving, and ſoul-deſtroying Doctrines. You pretend to prove your *Minor* with much clearneſs, *As all the parings of Gold are Gold, ſo all the children of Chriſtians are Chriſtians*: The parings of gold are true gold; and the children of Chriſtians by this account are true Chriſtians, pared out from the ſpiritual man, being of the ſame nature: oh high priviledge! Chriſtians can beget Chriſtians, Saints can beget Saints by natural generation. Certainly if one of the preaching brethren had laid down ſuch an aſſertion, you would have counted him an illiterate *Ignoramus*, one altogether unmeet to have medled with the Scriptures, or to have ſpoken of the things of God: You would have accounted him no leſs then a blaſphemer, and worthy to be burnt with his Books. Well, but you proceed, *As all the Children of the Jews were Jews by birth*, Gal. 2. 15. *And all the Children of the Turks are Turks by birth, ſo all the Children of Chriſtians are Chriſtians, and have a right to Baptiſm.*

Anſw. 1. The Jews were all in an outward Covenant, and ſo they were born Jews, *viz.* in that Covenant; but believers are in the Covenant of grace, as hath been already proved, and none are born in that Covenant by natural generation and birth: ſo that although Jews were Jews by birth, yet Chriſtians are not ſo by the natural birth, *for that which is born of the Spirit, is Spirit.* But

But ſecondly, the Jews were ſo by birth, as a diſtinguiſhing title from other Nations; ſo the Turks are Turks, and the Spaniards are Spaniards, and the French are French, and the Engliſh are Engliſh by birth, but they neither of them are Chriſtians by birth.

But you ſeem to mend all in anſwering an Objection. *Then we ſhould be born Chriſtians, and not made Chriſtians; we ſhould be born children of God, and not children of wrath.*

You anſwer: *Parents cannot convey grace to their Children, but a right to Church priviledges, &c.* unheard of nonſence and confuſion, miſerable bald ſhifts men make to patch up their own inventions: 1. *Chriſtians, yet no grace; a right to Church-priviledges, yet no grace; Members of the Church, yet no grace:* page 23. *Nay members of the Church, Chriſtians, a right to Church-priviledges, holy, &c. and yet have no grace, are the children of wrath, page* 23. theſe are like to be goodly Chriſtians, Church Members, &c. Yet you diſlike with the Anabaptiſts for not taking notice of this diſtinction, &c. A ſtrange kind of diſtinction; to make them Chriſtians, yet no Chriſtians; Members of the Church, yet children of wrath. I ſuppoſe you would learn to diſtinguiſh a little better, were it not to pleaſe the vulgar ſort of people, that ſo they may pleaſe you, in feeding you with the Tythes. A ſad thing, when you ſhall lead along ſouls blind with the name of Chriſtian, yet children of wrath, and if mercy prevent not, are like to periſh eternally, for all the name of Chriſtian: Thus are ſouls deluded by their Teachers, called Chriſtians, made Church-members, and yet *Children of wrath, &c. Alike children of wrath as Heathens*, page 10.

The fifth Argument.

From Christs command and commission to his Disciples, *Mat.* 28. 19. and from the Apostles practise, answerable to that command, thus your argue.

That which is both commanded and commended, that hath both precept, president, and promise for it, may lawfully be practised by the Ministers of Jesus Christ.

But Infant-Baptism is both commanded and commended; for it there is both precept, president, and promise.

Ergo.

Well said namesake *Tom:* Prove this, and thou hast done the deed that never yet was done: Prove this, and I will lay down my Arguments and practise too. Had you a good cause, you its like would be very bold, that you dare be so bold in asserting such an Argument in such positive terms, when there is never a word in Scripture of either precept, president, or promise to the thing you are pleading for: so that your *Minor* is denyed.

You pretend to prove it, *Mat.* 28. 19. you say, *Christ Commandeth his Disciples, and in them all Ministers successively, to the end of the World, to go and baptize Nations*; you say, *Children are a part of the Nations, therefore they are commanded to be baptized:* but there is, as you afterwards confess, a *Discipling first, Disciple Nations, baptizing them*, and here is no command for Infant-baptism, but for the baptism of Disciples; you pretend to put off this *With the dangerousness of building Arguments on the bare placing of words in Scripture*; you produce *Repentance and* Judas's *sop: Repentance sometimes placed before Faith, yet we know it is a fruit of Faith.*

I answer, it is such a fruit of faith as is individual; and upon a right understanding, Repentance may as well be said to go before, as to follow after; for it is a change of the mind; and I querie whether any man did ever believe, or can believe before his mind is changed; its true, after believing the change is perfected more and more. But this is it which I affirm, That no man believes savingly without or before a change of the mind, which produceth a change of the conversation: As for the Sop, neither *Matthew* nor *Mark* saith that

Judas

Judas received it before the Sacrament; *Matthew* ſaith *chap.* 26.23. *He that dippeth with me in the diſh ſhall betray me*; but he doth not expreſs when it was done, before or after; ſo *Mark* expreſſeth *chap.* 14.20. *That he that dippeth with him in the diſh ſhould betray him*, but he doth not tell whether it was before or after; therefore what *Luke* ſaith is no contradiction, but rather a clearer explanation. And whereas you ſay you will *upon the account of placing words, eaſily prove Baptiſm to be before Preaching*, Mark 1.4. *John did baptize in the Wilderneſs, and preach, &c. Here Baptiſm is ſet before Preaching ſay you, &c.* but this is anſwered and explained by *Matthew* Chap.3. 1, 2. *John the Baptiſt preached in the Wilderneſs of Judea, ſaying, Repent, for the Kingdom of heaven is at hand*, and ver.5,6. *they were baptized of him in Jordan*: And this is according to the Analogie of Scripture, Preaching, Diſcipling, believing, confeſſing of ſins, repenting before baptizing; and produce if you can, that ever baptizing was ſet before believing, &c. and not explained by another Scripture, as that of *Mark* explained by *Matthew*: and then take heed, fear and tremble to change Scripture phraſes at your pleaſure, for your own ends, taking that firſt, which is and muſt be laſt. You may upon this very account turn out, and contradict all the moſt precious truth of God in Scripture; and this very thing ſtrikes at it; for the reaſon why Teaching, Diſcipling and Faith is to precede baptiſm, is evident, that it is becauſe its Chriſts appointment, and there is a neceſſity that faith go before works; for there is no work acceptable before, or without faith; but *Thomas Hall* will have works go before faith, baptiſm before faith; though Chriſt hath ſaid the contrary, and ſo make void the Law of Chriſt, and the Faith of Jeſus, lay another foundation, works before faith, baptiſm before believing. and ſo teach men to ſin, *For whatſoever is not of faith is ſin*: *And he that breaketh one of the leaſt Commands, and teacheth men ſo to do, ſhall be called the leaſt in the Kingdom of heaven*, Mat.5.19 What then ſhall become of thoſe who break the great commands of Faith and Baptiſm, that overturn the very foundation, ſetting up works before and without Faith; and that you may do it, you chop and change the Scripture, that ſo you may accompliſh your own deſigns upon the account of Chriſt. But all your Logical Arguments, and humane diſtinctions will not, cannot ſatisfie thoſe whoſe eyes are enlightned, to ſee out of obſcurity, and out of darkneſs: So the truth ſtands firm as Chriſt himſelf, that is, firſt diſciple, then baptize; and the practiſe of the Apoſtles anſwered this Command,

Command, they never baptized any in the Nations but Diſciples; And this word μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, *Diſciple all Nations*, holds forth the breaking down of that middle wall of partition; and ſo the going forth of the Goſpel to the Gentiles, for ſo that word ἔθνη ſignifieth, Gentiles as well as Nations; and it intends not all Nations, *viz.* every one in the Nations, but all that believed, and became Diſciples in the Nations, *Act.* 10. 35. *In every Nation, he that feareth God, and worketh righteouſnes ſhall be accepted.* Now where is your command Sir for your practiſe ſo much pleaded for? for you confeſs, pa. 28. *That this place ſpeaks properly of the order preſcribed for converſion of Heathens that were adult*: Then you have no command in this Scripture for your practiſe; you are loſt upon your own account.

You grant, page 29. *That all baptized ones muſt be taught, but not all at the ſame time; ſuch as are capable of teaching, are to be taught before baptizing; but Infants of believers are to be baptized firſt, and taught afterward.* But you have no Scripture for this; it ſeems your word muſt ſtand for proof to thoſe who will believe it; you inſtance 2 *Theſſ.* 3. 10. *He that will not labour, muſt not eat; Infants cannot labour, yet they muſt eat.* True, but what is that to the thing in hand? Do you think the Apoſtle intended that, to give advantage to you to overturn the Commands of Chriſt? there is a neceſſity for Infants to eat, but none to be baptized, unleſs there be a neceſſity to break the Law of Chriſt, and a neceſſity to make them hypocrites, &c.

You ſay, *There is a teaching after baptizing*, Mat. 28. 20. *A teaching before and after; and that baptizing is ſet in the middle, implying, that ſome muſt be taught before* (viz.) *Heathens; ſome after* (viz.) *Infants of believers.* But you are much miſtaken in the ſecond; but it implyeth that there is a teaching before for the working of faith, and a teaching after for the building them up in the ſame faith: for that end God hath appointed Prophets, Paſtors, and Teachers in the Church; and theſe Acts 2. 41. *that were baptized*, ver. 42. *continued ſtedfaſt in the Apoſtles doctrine, &c.* So that this is the teaching before and after baptiſm there intended.

You confeſs *page* 31. notwithſtanding your bold aſſertion in your Argument, *That all your Command is but a conſequential command, and ſomething equivalent to a command, an implicite command, a neceſſary conſequence, &c.* I adviſe you to take heed, firſt how you lay down Arguments for the future in ſuch poſitive terms to delude the ſimple, yet confeſs at laſt it is but a neceſſary conſequence.

2. A little consider how necessary the consequence is; it is such a consequence as first makes void the command of Christ. 2. Makes null the Gospel of grace, setting up works before and without faith. 3. Makes all your worship vain; *In vain (saith Christ) do ye worship God, teaching for doctrines the traditions of men*, Mat. 15.9. *And thus you make the Commandments of God of none effect by your traditions*, ver. 6. I say, if this be permitted, to draw consequences from Scripture to overturn commands, it is the most dangerous way that ever was invented to usher in Heresie and Errour; and upon that account its easie to turn out almost all the truth of God in Scripture, and set it at variance against it self; we grant consequences rightly grounded, but we deny consequences to overturn Commands, and Gospel, and all: As for all that you say from *pag.* 31. to 34. it is nothing but a reiteration of what hath been said before, either in this, or your former Arguments. And notwithstanding you are pleased to say pag. 33. *That Infant-Baptism is clear enough to those who have eyes to see, or hearts to believe it.* To see and believe what you say, and take your word for all; for there is neither Scripture nor Reason for it.

Page 34. You say, *Since the Anabaptists call and cry so much for a literal Command.*

By the way, Sir, Are you such an enemy to literal Commands? will you make void literal commands, to set up your own inventions? or do you envy against them because they overturn your practises?

You say, *They may do well to give you Commands for many of their practises: As first, what express command they have to deny the Moral Law to be a rule of life.*

Answ. They deny not the Moral Law to be a rule of life to believers in its essence; but they deny it to be a rule of life as an administration in the hands of *Moses*: But Christ having taken it into his own hands, and fulfilled the righteousness of it, he gives it anew unto them, and it ceaseth to be any more the Law of *Moses*, but is the Law of Christ; this is cleared abundantly, 1 Joh 2.7,8. First, *It is no new Commandment, but the old.*

Yet secondly, *It is a new Commandment, which is true in him, and in us, because the darkness is past, and the true light now shineth.* So that notwithstanding it is the substance of the old, yet it is new, because in Christ, and from him to us, and in us: If this will not satisfie, see 1 *Cor.* 3.11. compared with 1 *John* 2.7,8.

3. You Querie, *What express command against the coercive power of*

the Magiſtrate ? I ſuppoſe you mean in the things of Jeſus Chriſt.

1. I ſuppoſe if Magiſtrates command any thing contrary to the mind of Chriſt, we are not to obey; they have nothing to do to make uſe of their coercive power there; if they do, they ſin, and all men are commanded not to ſin. That it is a ſin, is clear; That which contradicts the command of God is ſin: *Which ſhall we obey, God or man? judge ye*, Acts 4 19. There was the command of God, and the command of man in oppoſition each to other, and there the command of man was ſinfull.

2. Jeſus Chriſt is King of his Church, *Rev.* 15. 3. and its his work to make uſe of a coercive power, to bring in ſouls to his Kingdom, Pſal. 110. 4. *In the day of his power his people ſhall be a willing people*; and unleſs you can produce any Scripture, in which Chriſt hath reſigned his power to the Magiſtrate, I ſuppoſe he is ſtill King of his Church; and thoſe who make uſe of a coercive power in his Kingdom, are at beſt but Uſurpers.

3. Chriſt hath entruſted and impowered none but his Miniſters with that work of gather: g ſouls into his Kingdom; and this they are to do in his power, in his authority, and in his way: And thoſe who pretend themſelves to be the Miniſters of Chriſt, yet want the coercive power of the Magiſtrate, declare themſelves to be none of his, not ſerving the Lord Jeſus, but their own bellies, &c.

4. There is the ſubſtance of an expreſs command, *Rom.* 14.4. *Who art thou that judgeſt another mans ſervant? to his own maſter he ſtandeth or falleth, &c.* And Jam. 4.12. *There is one Law-giver, who is able to ſave and to deſtroy; who art thou that judgeſt another?* Its clear, that none have power to judge and determine coercively, but he that hath a power to ſave and deſtroy: And the Reaſon is drawn from *ver.* 11. that none hath power to judge of the Law, and give ſentence, *but he that is above the Law*; and if any will go about to judge others by a coercive power, *they are not doers of the Law, but Judges.* This is meant only in Caſes of Conſcience, relating to Jeſus Chriſt; not but that Magiſtrates may, and ought to take cognizance of Civil things, and ſinfull actions flowing from the corruptions of men; but matters Spiritual and Divine, tending to Worſhip, there its the prerogative of God alone to judge.

3. You querie, *What command we have to ſeparate from the Churches which hold the foundation pure?* I anſwer, None at all that I know; neither do we ſeparate from any ſuch Churches, but from *Babylon* and

and *Egypt*, which hath been and is a *cage of every unclean and hateſull birds*; not true or pure either in its Conſtitutions, Members, Miniſtery, or Ordinances: and we have a Command for what we do. See and well conſider 2 *Tim.* 3. from the firſt *ver.* to the laſt, and *Rev.* 18 4.

4. You querie, *What command we have for Rebaptizing?* *Anſ.* I know no ſuch thing as rebaptizing: there is a command for baptizing believers; and that which you call baptizing, *viz.* ſprinkling the faces of your Infants, we take no knowledge of it; you rantize them, and ſay you baptize them, ſo ſpeak an untruth. So that the juſt judgment of God is upon you, that having changed the Subject from a Believer to an Infant, you muſt change the very Ordinance it ſelf from baptizing to rantizing, from dipping to ſprinkling. So that you are wholly beſides, and have not the leaſt ground to ſay we rebaptize; for we baptize thoſe you have rantized before, it may be. Thus have I endeavoured to giue you a brief account of things you deſired, and ſo I paſs to your

Sixth Argument, p. 35.

From Act. 2. 38, 39. your Argument is,

To whomſoever the promiſe of grace belongs, to them Baptiſm belongs.
But the promiſe of grace belongs to believers and their children.
Ergo, *Baptiſm belongs to them both.*

This is but the ſame you have ſaid before: your Arguments being ſix in number, are but two in ſubſtance. Yet I ſhall ſee what you ſay to the buſineſs; for your *Minor* is denied: yet you are pleaſed to ſay, *p.* 36. in confirmation of your *Minor*, That the *Minor* flows from the Text; *the Parents believing and repenting, he expreſly commands them to be baptized, both believers and their children.* Oh unheard of falſhood! is there ever ſuch a word in the Text, as, *and their Children?* He ſaith, *Repent and be baptized every one of you*; that is, every one of you *that are pricked in your hearts.* You adde, *and their Children.* It ſeems you have either forgotten, or elſe you fear not that curſe denounced againſt him that *addeth to, or diminiſheth from the Words of this Book.*

The reaſon you render, is, *Becauſe the promiſe is to you and to your children Is, not was, and is now vaniſhed.*

Anſ. That Promiſe you ſo much plead for, which is but one and the ſame you have ſo often reiterated already, is vaniſhed away, and

the children of *Israel* are out of the Land of *Canaan*, &c. and we are under another, a better Covenant, a new Covenant, &c. *Jer.* 3. 31. *Heb* 8. *eſtabliſhed upon better promiſes.* That promiſe was the Land of *Canaan*; ours is the true promiſe of the Spiritual Land: they had the Land of *Canaan* promiſed, and it was made good while they kept Covenant with God; we have the Spiritual Land promiſed, and that is made good to all the Spiritual ſeed. And this is the promiſe here intended, and it is limited to all *that the Lord our God ſhall call.* 1. The promiſe here related, is intended only to called ones; and it is a reſtriction to all the ſeveral terms before. As many *of you as the Lord ſhall call. Of your children, as the Lord ſhall call Of them afar off*, viz. *Gentiles, as the Lord ſhall call.* For the truth is, that there is no promiſe in the Goſpel but to called ones. See this cleer, *Joel* 2. 32. the Scripture to which this in the *Acts* relates. *In mount Sion and in Jeruſalem ſhall be deliverance, as the Lord hath ſaid, and in the remnant whom the Lord ſhall call.* Its the very ſame with *Act.* 2. 39. and note, 1. The Call is not, as you plead, *univerſal*, but *to a remnant*; and thoſe who are thus called, ſhall be *delivered, ſaved.* This daſhes to peeces your aſſertions throughout your Argument: they are the called ones, and they only to whom the promiſe belongs; for the promiſes are all centered in Chriſt, and given forth to the called ones; not thoſe who are outwardly called, but effectually and ſavingly called. *Heb.* 9. 15. Chriſt is ſaid to be *a Mediator of a better Teſtament*; but you will have the ſame; ſo deny Chriſt to be come in the fleſh. *That by means of death for the redemption of the tranſgreſſions under the firſt Teſtament*, Chriſt died to deliver his people from the tranſgreſſions under the firſt *Covenant*, that ſo *they which are called might receive the promiſe of eternal inheritance.* Here is the promiſe, the *eternal inheritance*; the perſons to whom, *they that are called*, not infants the natural ſeed, but the ſpiritual: the ſame mentioned *Rom* 8. 30. *Whom he predeſtinated, them he called* &c. and to them, and them only the promiſe belongs.

This I doubt not but it will be enough to the judicious Reader to diſcover the vanity and emptineſs of all you ſay to this ſixth argument. For children are not taken literally any otherwiſe then as called of the Lord. For the *Jews* crucifying *Chriſt*, and wiſhing his blood to be upon them and their children; the *Gentiles* having a hand in it too, they *mocked him*, &c. they being *pricked in their hearts at* Peters *Sermon*, the Apoſtle applieth a ſuitable medicine to their wounded conſciences: he doth not tell them, of an outward promiſe, a Land of *Canaan*, an

outward

outward federal holineſs for themſelves & children, which they might have, and yet be damned at laſt; No, no, but a ſpiritual promiſe that might reach their ſouls in ſuch a condition: therefore in ſubſtance he ſaith, Notwithſtanding you have had a hand in crucifying the Lord Jeſus, the promiſe of the ſpirit of grace and of remiſſion *is to you, as many of you as the Lord ſhall call*; and notwithſtanding you have by your deprecations drawn guilt upon your children, yet the *promiſe is to them, as many of them as the Lord ſhall call*: and notwithſtanding the *Gentiles* have joyned with you in it, yet the *promiſe is to them, to as many as the Lord our God ſhall call.* And this is the ſenſe and truth of this Scripture: and I do affirm that there is no Goſpel-promiſe made to any but the *called of God*; and all others that get into the Goſpel-profeſſion, not being of the true ſpiritual ſeed, God will judge them in his time. And it is evident there were none baptized, bnt thoſe that gladly received his word, *v.* 41.

The ſeventh Argument, à probabili. *pag.* 40.

From Apoſtolical practiſe, which is in the nature of a Goſpel injunction to us. We read of divers families that they baptized, as *Cornelius* with his houſhold, *Act.* 10. 47, 48. compared with 11. 14. *Lydia* with her houſhold, *Act.* 16. 15. the Jailor and his, *Act.* 16 31, 32. *Criſpus* and all his houſe, *Act.* 18. 8. and the houſhold of *Stephanus*, 1 *Cor.* 1. 16. Your Argument is this.

If the Apoſtles baptized whole houſholds, then Children which are an integral part of the houſhold were baptized alſo.
But the Apoſtles baptized whole houſholds. Ergo.

The *Minor*, you ſay, none will deny; the *Major* you will prove. General, you ſay, include particulars: the word *houſhold* is a large word, and includes all, old and young, men, women, and children. &c.

But ſtay a little; are there any Children mentioned? if not, you have but probability at beſt; and I querie whether probability be a ſufficient ground to warrant a practiſe contradicting a poſitive command.

You ſay, *pag.*41. *Many things were done that are not mentioned in Scripture*; that *Chriſt and his Apoſtles did many things that are not written*, Joh.20.*ult*.

I anſwer, 1. If it had been done, yet not being written, ſilent authority proves nothing. All you can ſay, is but that it *might be done*, not that it was done; becauſe it is not written.

2. To look after things not written, to contradict and make null things that are written, take heed of that *Thomas*: if your name ſake the *Collier* ſhould have laid down ſuch a Principle, you would have ſaid ſomewhat to it. But I paſs it by; a word to the wiſe is enough. But I ſhall rather come to diſcover the grounds of your Probabilities from thoſe families.

The firſt is in *Act.*10.47,48. *Cornelius* and his houſhold, they were firſt *ſuch as heard the word*; therefore not Infants! *v.*33. *Now therefore are we all here preſent before God to hear all things that are commanded thee of God.* Secondly, *v.*44. *The Holy Ghoſt fell on all them that heard the word.* Thirdly, they were thoſe, and only thoſe that were baptized, which heard the word, and had received the holy Spirit. *ver.* 47. *Can any forbid water, that theſe ſhould not be baptized which have received the holy Spirit as well as we? And he commanded them*, viz that had heard, and received the Spirit as well as they, *to be baptized.* Where are your *Infants* now? and where is your *probability* for your praſtiſe? Blame me not if I undermine you; for I am a *Collier*, and muſt dig up the blackneſs, that truth may appear.

The ſecond family is *Act.*16.15. *Lydia and her family*; there might be *Infants*, ſay you. Querie 1. whether *Lydia* was a maid, widow or wife? *Anſ.* It is generally concluded on all hands, that ſhe had no husband; for if ſhe had, he had been mentioned; for alwayes the man bears the denomination, where there is any, and not the woman. If it be objected, he might not be baptized, therefore not mentioned: I anſwer, the houſhold were baptized, therefore the husband, if any; and he muſt have born the name, being the chief. So its clear, there was no husband; then where is your probability for Children? Secondly, the houſhold of *Lydia* were brethren capable of comfort, therefore not Infants, *v.*39.

The third family mentioned is the Jailors, *Act.*16.31,32,33. You ſay, *pag.*43. *That he believed, and preſented his houſhold upon his faith, and they were baptized.*

Anſ. Conſider a little better of this Scripture. 1. The Jailors houſ-

hold

hold were ſuch as were all capable of hearing the word. *v.* 32. *And they ſpake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his houſe.* 2. They were ſuch as with him rejoyced, believing in God. *v.* 34. *And when he had brought them into his houſe, he ſet meat before them, and rejoyced, believing in God with all his houſe.* So that they firſt hear, ſecondly believe, thirdly are baptized. Where is your probability for Children now?

The fourth houſhold is *Criſpus*, Act. 18. 8. The text is clear, *He believed in God with all his houſe.*

The fifth is *Stephanus*, 1 Cor. 1. 16. This houſhold was ſuch as were *addicted to the miniſtry of the Saints*, 1 Cor. 16. 15. therefore not Infants. But it ſeems you do not like to have theſe two Scriptures joyned together, becauſe the one ſo cleerly explains the other. 2. You ſay, *that thoſe that were of years might miniſter, when Infants were only baptized.* I wonder what you mind by *only*: were the Infants only baptized, and thoſe that did miniſter to the Saints not baptized? That ſeems to be the probability, and as like as the other. But the text ſaith, *Ye know the houſhold of Stephanus*, viz. the ſame houſhold as was baptized. You will diſtinguiſh for your own end; when he ſaith, *the houſhold*, that is, ſay you, *thoſe that were of years.* But you will permit no ſuch diſtinction to us, were not the Scriptures through mercy made cleer; but it muſt be all the houſhold, not the major part for the whole. Yet here you can preſently divide or diſtinguiſh for your own ends, when there is no place for a diſtinction. Theſe things thus conſidered, let the Reader judge impartially the weight of your probability for precept, promiſe, or preſident, as you have ſumm'd it up in the concluſion of this Argument.

The eighth Argument, p. 44.

Elect Infants may be Baptized;
Some Infants are Elect.
Ergo, *Some Infants may be Baptized.*

1. I deny your *Major*, though you are pleaſed to ſay its granted by Mr. *Tombs*: you abuſe him; he ſaith, if that it were made known to us by their ſanctification, which is not; ſo that Baptiſm was never adminiſtred upon this account, *viz.* of Election, but Believing: ſo that though ſome Infants are Elect, yet none are to be baptized upon that account

account only, God having given us a visible rule to walk by, and not to walk by such invisible rules, which is known to God alone.

You confess page 45. *That Election is a secret thing, and that it belongs to God*; how dare you then to forsake that rule Christ hath laid down in the Gospel, and dig after Gods secrets: But were it truth what you say, That elect Infants might be baptized if we knew them; you do not know them, therefore you cannot baptize them; God hath given us a surer way.

2. Should it be granted by way of concession; if elect infants might be baptized, will you therefore baptize all? thats the way to be sure indeed to catch the Elect: but take heed of inventing and maintaining a way which never came into the heart of Jesus Christ to command; look rather at things revealed, and leave secret things to God.

The ninth Argument.

All Disciples ought to be baptized.
Infants are Disciples.
Ergo.

The *Major* you say none will deny; the *Minor* is denyed; you say its proved divers wayes.

1. *Those which the Scripture cals Disciples, they are Disciples; but the Scripture cals Infants by the name of Disciples.* Acts 15. 10. *Why tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the neck of the Disciples? And Circumcision is the yoke whereof the Apostle is speaking; and they on whose necks this yoke lay, were ordinarily Infants.* But were these Infants mentioned in this Chapter, or was it not the Church of *Antioch* that was troubled with legal Teachers? As a Child almost an Infant, one of those you are pleading for, might understand; a simple and weak Argument, to prove Infants Disciples; there was circumcising others besides Infants, when they came to be Proselytes; *And the Jews calling themselves Moses Disciples*, John 9. 28. because they owned *Moses* Doctrine, as they thought, in opposition to Christ; therefore you say, *Infants were* Moses *Disciples*; a goodly conclusion. A Disciple is one that is doctrinated, or taught the principles of *Moses*, or the principles of Christ; this are not Infants, therefore none of the Disciples of Christ.

2. You

2. You ſay you prove it thus.

To belong to Chriſt, is to be a Diſciple of Chriſt.

Infants are ſaid to belong to Chriſt.

Ergo.

The *Major* is denyed: For though all true Diſciples belong to Chriſt, yet all that belong truly to Chriſt, are not Diſciples. All the Elect belong to Chriſt before they come into the world, nay before they are conceived, yet they are not Diſciples. *Saul* belonged to Chriſt before his converſion, yet *Saul* was not a Diſciple before, but an enemy, a perſecutor of the Diſciples: and the truth is, that no man is a Diſciple before he receive the doctrine of Jeſus Chriſt; you make up ſtrange Diſciples for the Lord, ſuch as we never read of in Scripture; you catch them in their Cradles to make them Diſciples; but they are never the rather for that the Diſciples of Chriſt. The Church of *Epheſus* belonged to Chriſt before their converſion, yet ſee what Diſciples they were before, *Epheſ* 2.1,2,3. And likewiſe the Church of *Corinth*, 1 *Cor.*6.9,10,11. And this I dare be bold to affirm, That there is never a man or woman that is a Diſciple indeed, but knows a time when he was not a Diſciple; and yet now can ſee and ſay that he belonged to God before he was a Diſciple.

Your *Minor* I queſtion not, *but that ſome Infants belong to Chriſt.*

3. You ſay, *They are capable of Gods own teaching, &c.*

That is not queſtioned, what capacity, but what they are, and what it appears they are taught, when they are grown up to manifeſt it: their capacity makes them no more Diſciples, then *Sauls* capacity made him a Diſciple before he was converted.

4. You ſay, *They are Church members, and ſo by conſequence Diſciples:* Hence you argue.

All Church members are Diſciples.

Infants of believing Parents are Church-members.

Ergo.

The *Minor* is denyed: You ſeem to refer to Mr. *Baxter.* This being Mr. *Baxters* grand Argument, I ſhall ſay ſomething to it in this place, though I have in brief anſwered it already. If I grant they were Church-members, yet they are not ſo now, we being under another miniſtration, more ſpiritual, more immediate; and he owns none to be members of the Church, but thoſe who are truly ſpiritual; when but one comes in without a wedding garment, he takes notice of him,

Friend, how camest thou in hither without a wedding garment? Mat. 22. 11,12. And you bring in none else but those without a wedding garment; what account you will give your Lord, I know not: but I shall let you see the repeal of that Church-membership you so much boast of: the Promises made to *Abraham*, run all into Christ, and are dissolved into him, *Gal.* 3.16. So that if you trace the Promises, you shall see where they all center; *The promise was made to Abraham, and to his seed; he saith, not to seeds, as of many but to his seed, which is Christ.*

2. See to whom the Promises come forth, whether to the natural, or to the spiritual seed. ver. 29. *If you are Christs, then are ye Abrahams seed, and heirs according to the promise.* So that you must now be Christs, before you can be *Abrahams* seed; and then being Christs, we are heirs according to the promise. So here is the promise, and the heirship; you need not go so far back into the old Testament, if the Lord enlighten your darkness. And how come we to be Christs? by believing, *ver.* 26. Rom. 2. 28 29. *He is not a Jew that is one outward, but he is a Jew that is one inward, &c.* So that the outward Jew, the natural seed, is cut off from the spiritual Covenant; for when the outward Covenant was ended, and the spiritual one was come, then the natural Church-membership was lost, and the spiritual one come in: if what you would have were truth, that it were the same Covenant, and the same members, then the Jews had not been broken off to this day; for they are the seed of those that were members in the first Covenant; but they are broken off for want of faith, which alone gives an interest in the Covenant, and we by faith stand: So to wind up all, Infants of believers are not Disciples, no Church members, therefore not to be baptized.

The tenth Argument.

All that have faith, may be baptized.
But some Infants have faith.
Ergo.

The *Major* you say none will deny.

Yet give me leave to question it, and highly too; for first, those are to be baptized that manifest faith; if Infants have faith, which I shall question; in the second place yet they have not that faith which is required

required of those that are to be baptized, *viz.* In the manifestation of it; so then if Infants have faith, yet none knows that they have it; none knows who of them have it: Its apparant that none but the elect have it; further its apparent that but few of the elect have it neither in infancy; all that live and come to experience, they had it not in infancy, they can experience it, they know how they came by it: then it can be but those elect Infants that die that are believers; & then God can save without faith by vertue of his electing love in Christ; and if he doth work faith in them, that is able to save them without Baptism, it not being required of them: and its our duty to walk by Rule; then we walk safe; and to administer the Ordinances of Christ according to his minde, not our own: the minde of Christ is, that *he that believeth shall be baptized*, Mark 16. 16. that is, upon the hearing of the Gospel and confession of his Faith; not Infants, those that we know not whether they believe or no; he hath not left us so to walk in the dark: this I think is sufficient to answer both your *Major* and *Minor*, although for all you say to prove your *Minor*, there is no weight in it: neither do I clearly assent that Infants have faith. That Scripture you mention, *Mat.* 18. 6. is not so expres as you pretend or imagine; but it relates to those who are humble and meek, qualified as little children; see *ver.* 3, 4, 5. so that it is such a little childe so qualified, *one of those that did believe.*

1. Query. *What children are they that usually are persecuted for the name of Christ, Infants in nature, or children in Grace?*

2. Query. *Whether Christ is now teaching his disciples and encouraging them against suffering, or little Infants?*

By this you may with ease come to perceive what Believers are intended in this Text.

1. You say, *They receive the Kingdom of God*, Mark 10.15. It is not said that Infants receive the Kingdom of God; but *whosoever doth not receive the Kingdom of God as a little childe, &c.* that is, to be humble and meek and teachable, &c. and you had wisdom enough to give this interpretation your selves formerly; but that now the case is altered you need to apply it another way.

And 2. Though some Infants do receive the Kingdom, &c. Yet it is not many as you have heard already, not all.

3. You say, they please God because he blessed them. Doth God use to bless Infants or others because they please him? or doth he bless them with Grace because he pleaseth himself in so doing, when they are enemies to him?

4. *Faith*, you ſay, *muſt be allowed them, elſe not ſalvation.* And when the Scripture ſpeaks of faith, it intends it to ſuch as are adult; and thoſe who are adult, not believing, ſhall be damned; the Scripture determines nothing about Infants, but leaves it as a ſecret to God; for they cannot have that faith the Scripture ſpeaks of, which comes by hearing; and the Scripture ſpeaks of no other faith, that I know of; and therefore they cannot have that damnation the Scripture threatens to unbelievers; though the elect Infants dying may obtain through the Grace of Election the ſame Salvation without Faith, as believers do through faith, *Rom.* 11.7.

5. You ſay, *Though Infants cannot make an actual profeſſion of faith as adults can; yet being born in the boſom of the Church they have ſomewhat to bring, &c. Yet are children of wrath as well as the children of the Gentiles are*, as you confeſs before, 1. *Reckoned in the number of Gods people with the Parents.* No truth in that, as hath been often proved; none are accounted for the ſeed but Believers. 2. *Some of them elect, &c.* 1. That *ſome*, you know not. 2. For that *ſome*, you will take in all: Finde out the Elect, and then we ſhall be ſilent: you ſay, *Hence we read that ſome children had the ſpirit in their infancy; John Baptiſt had faith in the womb*; the Scripture ſaith it not, its only *Thomas Hall's* words, *Jeremiah ſanctified from the womb*, &c. and what of all this? its not one ſwallow makes a Summer: becauſe *John* and *Jeremiah* were ſanctified, that is, ſet apart from the womb to their particular offices, therefore *all Infants are ſanctified*: a goodly concluſion, becauſe *Balaams* Aſſe did ſpeak, therefore all Aſſes may ſpeak; a likely matter.

You ſay, *The Promiſe is, that in the Goſpel-times the childe ſhall die an hundred year old, &c.* Iſa. 65 20. that is, ſay you, *They ſhall be bleſt with ſpiritual life and light from Chriſt, as if they had lived an hundred years in the Church of God*; when that relates to a ſpiritual glory in the Church of Chriſt, which is yet to come; not of the Natural, but of the Spiritual Seed, when they ſhall be freed from the former weakneſs and temptation; this Scripture Anſwers *Rev.* 21.1,2,3. 2 *Pet.* 3.13. And whereas you ſay, *though Infants cannot lay hold on Chriſt, yet he can lay hold on them.* We queſtion not Chriſts laying hold on them; but we are not to baptize them till they lay hold on Chriſt. *Pag.* 49. you ſay, *Infants have faith, repentance, regeneration*; and before you confeſs *they are children of wrath, alike the children of wrath as heathens are*: pag. 10. *yet now faith, repentance, regeneration,*

tion; unheard of contradictions! If your preaching brethren had written ſuch palpable contradictions, you would have concluded that it had been either for want of learning, or through much forgetfulneſs; but you mend the buſineſs well you think. *It is virtually and potentially, by way of inclination, &c. They have the ſpirit and ſeed of faith, &c.* The truth of this appears apparently in Infants when they are grown; doth the ſeed of faith appear, or the ſeed of corruption? Come forth O all ye that have any experience of the grace of Ieſus, and work of faith with power, ſpeak you knowledge in this particular, whether there be in Infants an inclination, and the ſeed of faith; or whether there be not rather an inclination to every thing that is evil, and the power of corruption remaining in them? Be aſhamed and bluſh, to utter ſuch known untruths, and unheard of contradictions; *Children of wrath, yet the ſeed of faith, inclinations to believe*; I ſay no more, but leave this Argument likewiſe to the wiſe conſideration of the Reader.

The eleventh Argument.

That way which doth confound the two Sacraments, and take away the diſtinction which God hath put between them, cannot be the way of God.

But the way of the Anabaptiſts doth confound the two Sacraments, and takes away that diſtinction which God hath put between them.

Ergo, *Tis not the way of God.*

Anſw. There is no truth in your *Minor*; for firſt, where is the Scripture that ſaith baptiſm is only for *Initiation*, and not for *Confirmation*; its a fancy of your own brain; may not baptiſm be be initiation and confirmation too?

2. If it be truth what you ſay, that Baptiſm is only for initiation into the Church, what is become of your Mr. *Baxters* grand Argument, *That they are members of the Church?* then not initiated in by baptiſm; one of your Arguments muſt of neceſſity be falſe. I ſay both of them as relating to Infants.

3. It was the Apoſtles practice to baptize believers, and give them the Supper too; and did they *confound the two Sacraments as you call them*? bear with me, for I know no Scripture cals them ſo. So that the way of the Anabaptiſts, as you falſely & reproachfully call them, doth

not confound the Ordinances, but preſerve them in their place, to the right end, according to the right rule; and you it is confound Ordinances, obſerving neither rule, place, nor end.

The twelfth Argument.

Such as were typically baptized under the Law, may be really baptized under the Goſpel.
Infants were typically baptized under the Law.
Ergo.

You reaſon from the type to the truth.

In this take a view likewiſe of your own ignorance, in not underſtanding the difference between type and antitype, type and ſubſtance, type and truth; and ſhew me if you can any one type in all the Scripture that typed out another type; you may as well ſay that the Jewiſh Sacrifices typed out the Goſpel Supper, &c. But all types related to ſubſtances, and Chriſt was the ſubſtance of all legal types; this truth will be clear in the reſolving of theſe queſtions.

1. If Chriſt be the ſubſtance of all types, whether or no the baptizing of the natural ſeed in the type, do not repreſent unto us the baptizing of the ſpirituall ſeed into the ſubſtance? 1 *Cor.* 12.13. *Gal.* 3.27.

2. Whether or no, as all the natural ſeed were baptized into *Moſes* and into the ſea and cloud, ſo all the ſpiritual ſeed ſhould be baptized into the profeſſion of faith of Jeſus? *Mat.* 28.19. *Act.* 19.

3. Whether to make the ſubſtance no other then the type, the Covenant of the Goſpel no other then that of the Law, the ſeed of the Goſpel-Covenant the ſame as the Legal, the adminiſtration of Goſpel ordinance on the ſame ſubjects as of the Legal, notwithſtanding Chriſt hath given cleer rules to the contrary, be not to make null the Goſpel, and to deny Chriſt to be come in the fleſh, and ſo to be the *Antichriſt*? *Gal.* 5.2. *Mat* 28.20. *Act.* 3.22. 1 *Joh.* 4.2 3.

In a word, if you will make this type the ground of your baptizing Infants, firſt then you do not hearken to Chriſt the ſubſtance, but honour him in the type, deny him in his perſon and ſpirit: ſecondly, you are to baptize them as they were in the type, *viz.* in the cloud and in the ſea. What is that to your ſprinkling of Infants? Thirdly, you may from hence, if that be your warrant from whence you ground your practiſe, baptize your Cattel too, for all paſſed through the ſea:

and

and indeed not to be a pattern to you that you might hence take occaſion to ſprinkle Infants, ſo denying Chriſt; but a type of Chriſt the Saviour and Deliverer of his people; that as the natural ſeed were ſaved in the type, ſo the ſpiritual were and are ſaved in the ſubſtance, *viz.* in Chriſt. All you ſay to this Argument being thus untruly grounded, is but a *non ſequitur*, and ſo I leave it.

The thirteenth Argument.

From the priviledges that Chriſt purchaſed for Infants.

Thoſe who are ſubjects of Chriſts kingdom, have right to the priviledges of ſubjects.
But ſome Infants are ſubjects of Chriſts kingdom.
Ergo, *Some Infants have right to the priviledges of Subjects.*

You ſay, *The ſeal of the Covenant is a choiſe priviledge.* I have often ſaid, and ſay again, that Baptiſm is no ſeal of the Covenant, but the Spirit.

To your ſecond Argument I ſay, there is no truth in your *Major*; for there is not a word of Baptizing in the Text; and therefore no ground to receive them to Baptiſm, though Chriſt received them and *bleſſed them.* I ſhall anſwer the Scripture more at large by and by.

As to the third, *Thoſe that Chriſt invites, the Church may not refuſe.* Where doth Chriſt invite Infants? Thoſe Infants are gone long ſince. He ſaith, *Suffer the Infants*, not all Infants. 2. The Church are to receive thoſe Chriſt hath given rule and command to receive, *viz. Believers.* Chriſt may receive ſome Infants, becauſe he knows them: The Church doth not know them, therefore the Church may not receive them.

4. You ſay, *They that are capable of the Kingdom and Bleſſing, which is the greater, are much more capable of Baptiſm, which is the leſſer. But Infants are capable of the greater.* Ergo.

Anſ. Some Infants by vertue of Election may be capable of the greater, yet not capable of the leſſer. 1. Becauſe not capable to underſtand the leſſer. 2. Becauſe we are not capable to underſtand and know them. 3. Becauſe there is no command for it; for that is it we are to walk by, and that capacity in which we are to judge.

5. You ſay, *If the Kingdom of heaven receive them, the Church may not exclude them.*

Anſ. The Kingdom of heaven, of glory, receives none but the elect of God: the Church doth not know them; therefore the Church cannot receive them, &c.

Now to your Scripture, *Mar.* 10. 14. *Suffer the little Children, and forbid them not.* Note, he ſaith not, ſuffer little children, but ſuffer the little children; not all little children, but *the little ones*, that is, thoſe that were then brought unto him. You draw a Concluſion from hence to have all, *p* 3,4,5. It's evident in that, that he would have them to come to him, that ſo he might take an occaſion to diſcover a Goſpel-myſterie, viz. *That of ſuch is the Kingdom of Heaven*; that is, ſo qualified ſpiritually, as they were naturally, meek, humble, teachable, helpleſs, &c. This is cleer, compared with *v.* 15. *Verily I ſay unto you, whoſoever doth not receive the kingdom of heaven as a little child, he ſhall not enter therein*; that is, as I ſaid before, ſo qualified ſpiritually, as little children are naturally. Hence 1 *Pet.* 2 2. *As new born babes deſire the ſincere milk of the word, &c.* that is, not as new-born babes deſire the ſincere milk of the word; but as new-born babes deſire the milk of the breaſt, ſo do you deſire the milk of the word. *Mat.* 18. 2, 3. 4. cleers the whole. *Except a man be converted and become as a little child, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven.* So that the ſubſtance of the whole in every Scripture mentioned by you to this purpoſe, directly preſents us with the ſame truth, *viz.* the humble childlike qualifications of his ſervants; and not to fill up the Church with Infants contrary to Chriſts command, and the practiſe of all his ſervants, which is to be our alone rule and preſident.

In a word, the Scriptures produced for proof of your Arguments, have not a word of baptiſm in them, nor the leaſt hint that way; and for you to draw conſequences from ſuch grounds, eſpecially thoſe conſequences overturning precepts and preſidents, is very dangerous and unſafe, and that which we are bound in duty and conſcience to renounce.

Chriſt knew what he had to do, and hath left us a rule for what we ſhould do; he that forſakes this rule, and will not hear Chriſt, *is to be cut off from amongſt his people* Acts 3. 22, 23. They that will draw concluſions into practiſe from what Chriſt did, contradicting what he hath commanded, will be found enemies not permitting Chriſt to reign over them; and what the danger will be of ſuch concluſions, ſee *Luke* 19. 27

The ſumme of all is this, that although Chriſt knows the Elect Infants

ſants, and receives them, yet we do not know them; it's Gods ſecret, and we are to walk by revealed rules, and are to receive none before the manifeſtation of faith, *Mar.*16.16. *Act.*8.37. and it's evident the Church did receive none but ſuch, *Act.*2.41,42. The Apoſtle in his Epiſtles writing to the Churches, cals them Saints, not Infants, 1 *Cor.* 1,2. 2 *Cor.*1.1. & 1 *Cor.*14.23. *If the whole Church be come together into ſome place, and all ſpeak with tongues, the unlearned will ſay ye are mad; but if all propheſie, &c.* Where note, the whole Church meets together, and they may, being thus aſſembled, all propheſie; and were here Infants, think you? They might *all propheſie*, none excepted that had the gift, but *women*. And 1 *Cor.*12.27. *The Church is the body of Chriſt, and members in particular:* and this body *is made up of many members. v.*28,29,30. and Infants are none of them. *Apoſtles, Prophets, Teachers, gifts of healing, helps in government, miracles, interpreters, &c.* There is never a true member in the Church of Chriſt, but hath ſome one or other of theſe gifts, more or leſs: here are no Infants, ſee *v.*13,14,15,16,17.

The fourteenth Argument.

From *Rom.* 12.26. you ſay, but I ſay 11.16. *If the firſt-fruit be holy, the lump is alſo holy; and if the root be holy, ſo are the branches.* The ſum of all you ſay is, *That by the root and firſt-fruit is meant Abraham, Iſaac, and Jacob.* p.62.

If it appear that there is no truth in this aſſertion, then your Argument fals to the ground: But there is no truth in this aſſertion. *Ergo.* I ſhall make it appear, 1. In the Covenant made with *Abraham:* his poſterity ſtood not by faith, but outward obſervation, Circumciſion, keeping the Law. *If thou be willing and obedient, thou ſhalt eat the good of the Land; if thou be diſobedient, thou ſhalt be deſtroyed with the ſword, Iſa.*1.19,20. But when Chriſt *the true root*, Iſa. 11.10. Rom.15.12. Rev.5.5. & 22.6. *and firſt-fruits*, 1 Cor. 15.20,23. was come, they not believing were broken off, becauſe not by faith graffed upon the true root. For when Chriſt the true ſpiritual ſeed was come, the natural ſeed and membership was broken off, and only that of faith was graffed in: That as the natural ſeed ſtood members upon the account of the firſt Covenant and promiſe made with *Abraham*; ſo the ſpiritual ſeed, *viz.* the ſeed of faith, Chriſt being come, and is the

ſubſtance of that Covenant, they are ingraffed into that root; he being holy, they are alſo holy, according to the words of Chriſt, *Joh.*15.1,2.

2. That this is the truth intended, will more clearly appear, if you conſider *v.*18. *Boaſt not againſt the branches* (*i e.* againſt the branches broken off) *for thou beareſt not the root, but the root thee.* Now, *Thomas Hall*, what root is it that bears the believing branches? Natural parents, or Chriſt the true root? Is not he the foundation upon which they are built, and the true root and ſtock into which they are ingrafted; and bears them up, and makes fruitful?

Whereas you ſay, *That by ingraffing in, is meant admiſſion into viſible communion.* I ſay, it is not only that; but firſt faith, and then admiſſion into viſible communion. And one word by the way; what viſible communion are Infants capable of, if they may ſome of them be capable of inviſible union and communion with Jeſus Chriſt; yet where is their capacity of viſible communion with the Church, which conſiſts in communicating of experiences; in Ordinances, *fellowſhip in breaking bread, and prayers?* where is your viſible communion of Infants, Sir?

You ſeem to anſwer an objection, *p.*63. *Paul* ſpeaks of an inviſible Church. For my part I own no ſuch objection; for I know no inviſible Church here upon earth: for a Church of Chriſt is a company of believers walking in the viſible profeſſion of truth; and there ſhould be none in that profeſſion, but ſuch as are believers indeed; and if any come into the outward, without the inward grace, they muſt be plucked up. Therefore I own not that diſtinction of *viſible* and *inviſible*. The inviſible Church are thoſe out of ſight, that are departed; the viſible are thoſe living in the viſible profeſſion of truth: and theſe are they which are graffed in, *Rom.*11. Thoſe that are graffed in truly, ſhall ſtand and thrive, the root Chriſt bears them; They that are but in ſhew ſhall fall, the root will not bear them, becauſe not graffed in by the heavenly Father. In all this here is no room for the natural ſeed. I leave it to the Reader to judge.

The

The fifteenth Argument.

From 1 *Cor.*7.14. *Else were your children unclean, but now are they holy.*

From hence you argue.

They that are holy with a Covenant-holineſs, may be baptized.

But Infants born of one believing Parent, are holy with a Covenant-holineſs.

Ergo, *Such Infants may be baptized.*

Your *Major* hath been often denied, for its but the ſubſtance of what you have often ſaid before; and therefore in ſubſtance I muſt anſwer what I have anſwered before; there is no ſuch thing mentioned in all the New-Teſtament as a federal holineſs, *viz.* an external Covenant-holineſs without an internal, this being the ſubſtance of what you ſay *pag.* 65. you confeſs children only by nature, *that there is no difference between the childe of a Chriſtian and the childe of an Infidel:* Yet conſider him as believing, ſo he and his are holy; he is holy ſpiritually, but are his Infants ſo too? no; you confeſs pag.62. *This caution muſt be remembred, that the holineſs you ſpeak of is not perſonal inherent holineſs, for this cannot be tranſmitted to poſterity; but tis a federal, external Covenant-holineſs.* Pray Sir the next time let me know where in the New Teſtament this ſame external holineſs, without the internal, is ſo much ſpoken of or commended: The Lord loveth truth in the inward parts, and condemns hypocriſie and hypocrites; he condemns the form without the power; he owns no *Jew but the ſpiritual, no ſeed but the ſpiritual: the axe is now laid to the root of the Tree; every Tree that bringeth not forth good fruit muſt be cut down,* Mat.3. and yet you are all for an outward holineſs without the inward, which is indeed and truth an abomination unto the Lord. But to come to the Scripture you pretend to ground your Argument from: You ſay, *The Anabaptiſts have invented an evaſion to avoid the force of the Text: that ſay they, its a matrimonial holineſs, that they are legitimate and no baſtards, &c.* Which I affirm, is the truth of the Scripture, and ſhall 1. give ſome brief anſwers to what you aſſert. And Secondly, ſet down my reaſons, for what I affirm. 1. *You pretend the many abſurdities that will follow if it be meant of a civil holineſs.* 1. *Then the children of Turks and Pagans born in Matrimony ſhould be holy.* *Anſw.* and why not upon a Matrimonial account, more

holy, that is, more lawfull then thoſe born of fornication? And whereas you ſay, *they are dogs that are without*, &c. It is true, that is, comparatively to the true Church and Spiritual Seed; ſo are not only Turks and Pagans, but moſt of your Church-members, who do the ſame, if not worſe works then they; only you have perſwaded them into an outward Covenant as you and they imagine; but that helps not the buſineſs. 2. Its ſin to wicked men what ever they do; yet their civil actions are better to them, as eating, drinking, plowing, Marriage, lawfull procreation of children, then the contrary evil actions; the Apoſtle ſaith that marriage is honourable among all, *Heb.* 13. 4. If among all, then among Turks, and their children are civilly holy, lawfully begotten according to a civil inſtitution; though nothing be truly and ſpiritually holy, but to thoſe in Chriſt; its a Law God hath written in the hearts both of Turks and Indians, that they are more conſcientious in defiling of the Marriage eſtate, then many of thoſe you call Chriſtians.

2. You ſay, *The Apoſtles reaſon would have no weight with it; for their children were legitimate before converſion, ſo he ſhould allow them no more priviledge then meer Infidels have, &c.* The Query is not, what they were before converſion, but one being converted, and the other not; the doubt ariſeth, whether or no, the Believer muſt put away the unbeliever: if he or ſhe muſt do ſo, then the children muſt be gone too, both before and after converſion, and this was a Priviledge to the Believer, not to be compelled to part with his children: though unbelievers had the ſame in being, yet it was not to them ſuch a priviledge, for mercy is mercy to a Believer indeed; he ſees every thing ſanctified to him, which the unbeliever doth not.

3. You ſay, *Then all baſtards are unholy, and muſt be damned.* Here is a ſimple one indeed, coming forth from ſo wiſe and deep a head as *Thomas Hall's*. 1. Muſt all be damned of neceſſity without the holineſs you are pleading for? 2. Do we or the Scriptures ſay, that Baſtards muſt be damned? do you know from whence you have drawn that concluſion your ſelf, that Baſtards muſt be damned? if that be not a federall holineſs, but a marriage holineſs; that their children are legitimate, then baſtards muſt be damned; Is this your Logick? I leave it with you.

4. You ſay, *The word holy is never uſed in all the Scripture for legitimation, but generally for a thing ſeparated from common uſe to Gods ſervice, &c.* 1. *Thomas Hall* ſhall confute *Thomas Hall* by and by; ſee

ſee *pag.*67. he ſaith, *That the ſanctification of the unbelieving husband to the believing wife, is not in reſpect of his perſonal condition, but in reſpect of his conjugal relation; though he continue unclean towards God, yet to his believing wife in a way of marriage he is ſanctified, that is, he is holy*: for ſo the Greek word ἡγίασται from ἁγιάζω ſignifieth, and in eſſence its the ſame as is ſaid of the child, νῦν ἅγιά ἐστι but *now are they holy*: ſo that firſt you ſay, *holineſs is never uſed in all the Scripture for legitimation, but generally for things ſeparated to Gods ſervice; yet here you confeſs, holineſs is attributed to the unbeliever upon the Marriage account; in way of Marriage he is ſanctified, &c.* And the Infants, or children are ſanctified with the ſame ſanctification in the ſame way, and this I take to be the *jennine* ſignification of this Scripture. I ſhall now give my reaſons for it.

1. There is no ſuch thing in the Goſpel as an external federal holineſs; its a meer invention of man, as I have often cleared.

2. This interpretation, *viz.* That they were lawfully begotten; 1. reacheth the thing in hand moſt ſutable: for, as Mr. *Hall* confeſſeth, *the Apoſtle is giving ſatisfaction to them concerning a ſcruple or doubt about mixed Marriages*, from *Ezra* 10.2,3. Nehem.13.23. And he ſatisfieth them, that the Believer need not put away the unbeliever, as the *Jew* did the Heathen; *for God had ſanctified the unbeliever to the believer; elſe were your children unclean*, that is, your children muſt depart, as thoſe did *Ezra* 10. and *Neh.* 13. *But now are they holy*, that is, holy as the unbeliever is holy; ſanctified as the unbelieving husband is ſanctified: This is ſutable to the thing in hand, they are ſanctified *as every creature of God is ſanctified to the believer*, 1 *Tim.*4.5. ἁγιάζεται, *it is ſanctified by the Word and prayer*; ſo is the unbeliever and children ſanctified to the believer, that he may comfortably injoy them.

3. It can be no other ſanctification then that of the unbeliever, and that is granted by *Tho: Hall*, to be but a Marriage-Sanctification, and the childes holineſs can be no other, for it flows from it; *the unbeliever is ſanctified, elſe were your children unclean, but now are they holy*. He doth not ſay, the Believer is ſanctified, elſe they were unclean, and that muſt have been the words to have made any thing for your federal holineſs; *but the unbeliever is ſanctified, &c.* It being thus cleared, that the holineſs of the childe flows from the Sanctification of the unbeliever, then its the ſame with the unbeliever; but it flows from it, therefore one with it; and this is concluded, that a

cauſe cannot produce a more excellent effect then it ſelf: the unbeliever he is ſanctified, ſaith *Tho. Hall* in way of marriage: then I ſuppoſe its clear that the childs ſanctification flowing from hence can be but of the ſame nature: theſe things thus conſidered, I leave it to the judgment of the Reader.

The ſixteenth Argument.

From the many dangerous errours and abſurdities that will follow this tenet.

1. *Then Chriſtians Infants ſhall be loſers by the coming of Chriſt. &c.*

Anſ. No loſers at all; for what advantage is it to be in an outward Covenant, and to have that which you call a Seal, and not to be in the grace of the Covenant, but to be *children of wrath as much as heathens*, as you confeſs *pag.* 10. a mear cheat, a ſeal to a blank: and the truth is, you cannot deviſe a greater cheat for Infants, then to tell them they are in the Covenant of Grace, yet children of wrath as well as heathens; in it, yet out of it; and by this are the nations cheated into a Form of Godlineſs, thinking themſelves in a Covenant of Grace, and in a moment go down to Hell.

2. You ſay, *Then grace ſhould be larger then, then it is now, &c.*

Anſw. No ſuch thing, the Covenants conſidered; that was a Covenant of the land of *Canaan* which belonged to all the Seed, therefore they were all circumciſed as a ſign of their obedience; and all partaked of the Promiſe which was but a Type of the Goſpel-Covenant: ours is a Spiritual Covenant of the Spiritual Land, the Lord *Jeſus*, and belongs to none but the Spiritual Seed; and to them its more excellent, and more large, and as ſure, if not more ſure then that was to the natural, *Rom* 4.16. That was large and ſure to the natural, this large and ſure to the Spiritual ſeed.

3. You ſay, *Then there would be no difference between the childe of a Chriſtian, and the childe of a Pagan, &c. Then Dogs and Swine, ſhut out of the new Jeruſalem*, Rev. 22.15.

Anſw. And is there any difference by nature think you, unleſs grace make a difference? doth your federal holineſs and baptiſm make ſuch a difference? doth it receive them into the new *Jeruſalem*, when you confeſs them *children of wrath, as well as the children of heathens are*, notwithſtanding your federal holineſs? Do not you by your pretended outſide holineſs rather ſhut them out of the *new* and *true Jeruſalem*?

lem? and dare you ſay, *Turks, Tartars, and Heathens are all ſhut out from thence?* May there not be a time when grace may reach them too? And may not Infants, when grown in years, have the means of working faith; and that in a more hopeful way, when dealt faithfully withall, and not deluded with a ſhadow without the ſubſtance; by which means they may through grace come to attain an intereſt in the new and true Covenant?

4. You ſay, *Then they are without Chriſt, without hope, without God* &c.

Anſ. And are they any better in your fained Covenant, unleſs they have an intereſt in truth in Chriſt and in God? Which is beſt; to be without Chriſt, and think they have him; or to be without Chriſt, and know it? And who are likelieſt to abide longeſt without Chriſt, thoſe who are deluded and cheated with ſomething like Chriſt, yet not him; or thoſe who are left as they are in their natural condition, that ſo they may have nothing to delude themſelves withall, but ſeek after the true God in the uſe of means, God making them ſenſible of the want of it?

5. You ſay, *Then they are the Devils children.*

Anſ. So they are, notwithſtanding your federal holineſs, if they do his work, *Joh.* 8.44. All you plead for, changes not the nature, but the name; a ſad deluſion!

6. You ſay, *This robs Chriſt of his glory; then the firſt* Adam *was more powerfull to deſtroy, then Chriſt to ſave*, &c.

Anſ. It is that makes for the glory of Chriſt; it's the fulfilling of his will and mind. But you diſhonour him, in calling his name upon a company of people that do not know him, nor honour him in their converſation. It ſeems you are an *Univerſalian*, you will have Chriſt to ſave all that fell in *Adam*; if all that partake of *Adams* ſin, muſt partake of Chriſt. Truly ſir, none are like to partake of Chriſts grace but believers, that I know of; and this faith is the gift of God, *Epheſ.* 2.8. Therefore take heed how you ſtretch the grace of Chriſt beyond what it was intended, leſt you delude ſouls with the name of grace, without the truth.

7. You ſay, *Then Infants have no original ſin*, &c.

Anſ. If they have, will your outward, outſide, pretended Covenant and Seal waſh it away? how then doth it leave them *children of wrath* ſtill, as the heathens? Oh ſad unheard of contradictions! They are not excluded from the preaching of the Goſpel, the ordinary means.

8. You

8. You ſay, *This robs Infants of their right, Parents of their comfort, the Church of her members, Chriſt of his merits, and God of his glory.*

Anſ. I tell you, there is a great cry, and but little wooll, when looked after. 1. *Children of their rights.* When Chriſt in the Goſpel hath nowhere given them that right. Secondly, when they have it given them, it is ſuch a right as deludes them, there is nothing in it, but words and wind. 2. *Parents of their comfort.* What comfort is it to parents who underſtand, and are not as ignorant as their babes, to have their children cheated, ſealed with a blank or a counterfeit that can do them no good? 3. *The Church of its members.* Alas, of what uſe are ſuch members in the Church of Chriſt? Did you ever find ſuch members there? There are, or ſhould be none but uſeful members. 4. *Chriſt of his merits.* Did Chriſt merit baptiſm for Infants? if ſo, you ſhould have proved it. Or purchaſe his Church? *Act.* 20.28. *Eph.* 5.25. 5. *And God of his glory.* What glory would Infants bring to God in the Church of Chriſt? Can they worſhip ſpiritually? Such *he ſeeks to worſhip him*, Joh. 4.24. Can they *offer up ſpiritual ſacrifice, acceptable, &c?* This is the work of the Church of Chriſt, 1 *Pet.* 2.5. and they that cannot do this, diſhonour God in his Church, and have nothing to do to be there. Theſe things thus conſidered, I leave the Reader to judge who diſhonor God moſt, thoſe who contrary to his revealed will thruſt upon him of their own heads a company of ignorant dead members, that do not know him, and cannot worſhip; or thoſe who according to his revealed will endeavour to keep the Church pure, and admit none but thoſe they judge living members, knowing that none elſe can offer to him living ſacrifice, acceptable, &c.

The ſeventeenth Argument.

From the benefit that redounds both to parents and their children.

1. *Much comfort comes hereby to Parents, when they conſider Gods free grace to them and theirs,* &c.

Anſ. 1. There is no ſuch thing in the Goſpel-covenant, as hath been already proved; neither have you, nor can you produce any ſuch word in the Goſpel-covenant: but that he is a God, a Father to the true ſeed, *viz.* the ſeed of Chriſt; and none elſe are accounted for the ſeed; they, and they onely who believe, have received *this priviledge,*

ledge, this right, to be called the children of God, Joh. 1. 12. And then,

2. What comfort can it be to Parents to have their Children called and accounted that which indeed at preſent they are not, not have no right ſo to be called or accounted? For the Covenant of grace is this, *I will write my Law in their heart*, &c. *ſo will I be a God unto you*, &c. *And ye ſhall no more teach one another, ſaying, Know the Lord; for ye ſhall all know me from the greateſt to the leaſt.* They that are accounted to be in this Covenant, are ſuch as *know the Lord* by vertue of their being *taught of him.* And this is ſet in oppoſition to the Covenant of the Law, which was made with the natural ſeed, which were a people for the moſt part not knowing God. But it is not ſo in the Goſpel-Covenant; there are none but thoſe who *know the Lord*, &c. *Jer.* 3 31. *Heb* 8.10,11. Therefore I ſay again, that it is but little comfort to thoſe Parents who are not more ignorant then their Infants, to have their Children called and accounted that which they are not; to have their Children (as you ſay) *admitted into Chriſts ſchool, members of his Church, ſheep of his fold, diſtinguiſhed from heathens, &c.* What true comfort can it be to Parents, or benefit to Infants to have all theſe outward things you pretend they gain by it, and yet may be without the truth of all; and are, as you confeſs, *Children of wrath, as well as the children of heathens?* Is not this the way to lead them on in a fools paradiſe; make them have good conceits of themſelves, that they are in the Covenant, and ſo delude and undo them for ever? And the truth is, and Chriſt hath ſaid it, *Joh.* 10.9. that *He is the door into the ſheepfold*, viz. the Church, *and none can enter in but by him*: and thoſe who enter by him *ſhall be ſaved, and ſhall go in and out and find paſture.* They ſhal not be mocked & cheated with an outſide *Covenant-holines, Church membership*, &c. as you ſerve the Children of the Nation: but they ſhall be ſaved &c.

The eighteenth Argument.

All will-worſhip muſt be avoided.
But the refuſing to baptize Infants of Chriſtian parents till they come to years of diſcretion, is will-worſhip.
Ergo, *It muſt be avoided.*

Your *Minor* is denied. You pretend to prove it with another Argument, wherein your weakneſs appears: the Argument is,

That which hath neither precept nor preſident for it in the word of God, is will-worſhip.
But the deferring the baptizing the Infants of Chriſtian parents, hath neither precept nor preſident for it in the word of God.
Ergo, *It is will-worſhip.*

Anſ. 1. That the weight of your Argument may the better appear unto the Reader, I ſhall give another Argument as well grounded as yours:

That which hath neither precept nor preſident for it in the word of God, is will-worſhip.
But the deferring the baptizing of the Infants of Heathen parents, hath neither precept nor preſident for it in the word of God.
Ergo, It is will-worſhip.

Secondly, I anſwer,

That which hath neither precept nor preſident for it in the word of God, is will-worſhip.
But the baptizing of Infants of believing parents hath neither precept nor preſident in the word of God.
Ergo, it is will-worſhip.

You confeſs 'tis true, *Men of years profeſſing faith are fit ſubjects of Baptiſm:* So then, upon your own confeſſion, we take the fit ſubjects. *But not the onely ſubjects, excluding Infants*, &c. Although the Scripture excludes all except men of years profeſſing faith. *I* prove it thus:

If there but one water-baptiſm mentioned in the Goſpel as an Ordinance of Chriſt by way of precept and preſident, and that is to perſons of years profeſſing faith; then all others are excluded.

But

But there is but one water-baptiſm mentioned in the Goſpel as an Ordinance of Chriſt, by way of precept and preſident; and that is to perſons of years profeſſing faith.

Ergo, All others are excluded. *Mat.*28.19. *Mar.* 16.16. *Act.*2. 38,39,41. *Act.*8.12.

You require a preſident for it. *Let any man ſhew but one example of any Child of God, that ever kept his Child unbaptized till he could make profeſſion of his faith*, &c.

Anſ. 1. VVhen you have produced any Scripture that requires Infants of Believers to be baptized, then ſhall I ſhew you a Scripture where they kept them back till they profeſſed faith.

2. There being no command for the practiſe of baptizing Infants, there needs no record for the keeping them from it; its enough that there is neither precept nor preſident for the doing of it: that was enough to them, and ſhould be to us.

3. The not doing of a thing is no part of worſhip: all worſhip conſiſts in doing or ſuffering the will of God; and ſuffering is a doing the will of God too: in both of which the renewed mind is active, as well as the body is in the one active, in the other paſſive, *Heb.*10.36. But the refuſing to baptize Infants is no part of worſhip, therefore cannot poſſibly be will-worſhip. If baptiſm of Infants were a command of Chriſt, as you ſay, though never proved; yet to neglect it is no more will-worſhip, then to neglect prayer, praiſing, or the like is will-worſhip; its no worſhip, not will-worſhip.

Thus have I briefly minded you of the ſimplicity and nonſenſe of your Argument in every particular; and proceed to your

Nineteenth Argument,

From the bleſſing of God upon the Churches that have practiſed Infant-Baptiſm.

Anſ. 1. If you mind by the bleſſing *outward proſperity*, I ſuppoſe the Church of *Rome*, whom you condemn for heretical in your ſeparating from her, hath had as great a ſhare, and the longeſt ſtanding of any Church or State in the world. And that is no trial of the truth of a Church, outward proſperity, and long continuance; for the Churches of Chriſt in the Primitive times were, and yet are under perſecution, reproach and contempt, but little proſperity in the world, *Joh.*16.*ult.*

2. If you mind, as you ſeem to intimate, *Becauſe ſo many bleſs God for their Infant-Baptiſm.*

Anſw. 1. So did many bleſs God for Epiſcopal Government, yet at laſt the very ſame bleſſed God for the fall of it.

2. I ſuppoſe, as many upright ſouls now are bleſſing God for his diſcovery of the vanity of it.

3. Its not mens bleſſing God for things, that proves the truth of theſe things, but the approbation of him who is Truth it ſelf.

4. If you mind, *becauſe thoſe you falſly call Anabaptiſts have been condemned perſecuted, and afflicted, as you intimate, and the others juſtified, upheld, &c.*

Anſw. 1. Its the likelier to be truth; for that hath alwayes paſſed under reproach and contempt: as for affliction, *Job* ſuffered much, the loſs of all; will you judge *Job* for his afflictions, and juſtifie his wicked enemies, yea and the Devil too that afflicted him? for ſhame learn more civility then to reaſon thus: did you never hear of *Iobs* loſſes? was it becauſe he was an Anabaptiſt think you? or was it becauſe God gave Satan liberty to try him, for his good? and may not God give Satan the ſame liberty to try his own ſervants, and it may be to prove the Devil a lyar, as he did in the trial of *Iob*? have you never heard of great part of Cities, Towns, and Houſes burnt? and was it becauſe they were Anabaptiſts think you? As for your vile and rayling expreſſions, I paſs it by, and leave it to the righteous Judge, who will do right both to his ſervants and his enemies.

The Twentieth Argument.

From the principles and practiſe of all reformed Churches.

That which is condemned by all the Churches of God, and is contrary both to their principles and practiſe, is unlawful.

But Anabaptiſm is condemned by all the Churches of God, and is contrary both to their principles and practiſe.

Ergo.

Anſw. Your *Major* is granted, *viz.* That that which is condemned by the principles and practiſes of the Churches in Scripture, and all thoſe reformed, or rather gathered upon the ſame principles and practiſes, is unlawfull.

Your

Your *Minor* is denyed; for baptizing of believers hath been, and is the principle and practise of the Churches of Christ: whereas you produce 1 Cor. 11. 16. *We have no such custome, nor the Churches of Christ*; I say there was no such custome as the baptizing of Infants in the Churches of Christ; and for those you call reformed Churches, the most of them, if not all, brought their baptism of Infants from their mother Church of *Rome*. So then, it is not the practise of the Church of *Rome*, or of her members that are rent from her that we look unto, but the Scripture, the word of truth, which should be both their and our rule; and when Churches or persons contradict that, let them be *Anathema Maranatha*.

And whereas you are pleased, as you pretend, in confirmation of what you have asserted in this Argument, to arraign the prisoner at the Bar, so producing your reformed Churches and Divines, so judging the servants of the Lord for their following of him, and obedience to him; Be assured, you will one day know what you have done, *When the Lord Iesus shall appear to render vengeance to those who know him not, neither obey his Gospel, but to be admired in all those who believe and follow him*, 2 Thes. 1.8. When he will judge his enemies *for all their hard words spoken against him*, Jude 5. and notwithstanding you can make so bold now to arraign the prisoner at the bar, *viz.* the servants of the Lord, for their professing and practise of the truth; yet the Lord will deliver them in his time, and they shall judge their Judges, *And bind their Kings in Chains, and their Nobles in fetters of Iron; this honour shall all the Saints have; praise ye Iehovah*, Psal. 149. Although I could, yet I shall in this trace you no farther, but leave you to the Judgement of him who will judge righteous Judgement between us in the end: referring those who desire to see more, as to this particular, to my book entituled *The Pulpit Guard Routed*.

So much briefly in way of answer to your *Font Guarded with twenty Arguments*.

Now I ſhould proceed to the diſcovery of the weakneſs of your Anſwers to the Scruples, Scripture-Objections, and Anſwers mentioned by you in your Book, in defence (as you call it) of Anabaptiſm.

But that firſt there are ſome Arguments not made uſe of that I know, but are rather your own inventions.

And ſecondly, becauſe the ſumme of all you ſay, hath been anſwered and confuted in what is written in anſwer to your Arguments: and it would be indeed but a tautologie, as you have very many in your Book, and upon that account I have been neceſſitated to make uſe of many, that ſo I might give ſome anſwer to you: I ſhall therefore refer the Reader for ſatisfaction to what you ſay in this which follows, to what I have written in anſwer to that which precedes; that which ſucceeds being but the ſubſtance of that which is gone before: only the ſecond and laſt I ſhall ſay ſomething unto.

The ſecond Objection, pag. 88. of your Book.

Baptizing of Infants is a new invention, found out by the Pope and the Devil, tis the mark of the Beaſt, invented by Antichriſt; either by Pope Higinus, *who lived in the ſecond Century, about* 150 *years after Chriſt: or elſe by Pope* Innocent *the third, who lived at leaſt* 1000 *years after Chriſt,* 1215.

You anſwer 1. *If* Higinus *Biſhop of* Rome, *were the firſt inventor of it, then it was more ancient then many will grant.*

2. You ſay, *That he was not the inventor of it, but you find by* Platina, *that he was the firſt that enjoined Sureties.*

And why not the firſt that enjoyned Infant-baptiſm? you produce nothing to the contrary but your word; and that the ſame authority that ordained the one, ordained the other, is very apparent.

1. Becauſe neither of them have any footing in the Scripture.

And 2. Becauſe Hiſtory relates, that both Infant-baptiſm, and Sureties, or Godfathers, came in together, as is related in the Hiſtory of the names and cuſtomes of all Nations, written by *Iohannes Boemus Aubanus*, a Dutchman, tranſlated out of Latine into Engliſh by *Edward Aſton*, 1611. page 159. he ſaith, *That Baptiſm heretofore, as it was eſtabliſhed by a Canonical ſanction, was not miniſtred unto any (unleſs*

leſs upon very urgent neceſſity, but unto ſuch as were beforehand well inſtructed in the Faith, and ſufficiently catechized and examined thereof ſeven ſeveral times, to wit, upon certain days in Lent, &c. But this Sacrament being above all the reſt moſt neceſſary to ſalvation, and leſt any one ſhould depart out of this life without the benefit thereof, it was ordained, that aſſoon as an Infant was born he ſhould have God-fathers procured for him to be his Witneſſes or Sureties; and that then the childe being brought by his Godfathers before the Church-door, the Prieſt ſtanding there for the purpoſe, ſhould demand of the childe, before he dip him in the holy Font, Whether he will forſake the Devil and all his pomps? and whether he believe all the Articles of the Chriſtian Faith; and the Godfathers affirming on his behalf, &c.

The reaſon why I record this in this place, is firſt to preſent to view the probability of *Higinus* bringing in of Infants Baptiſm; for you ſay, that you finde by *Platina*, that he brought in Godfathers firſt; and I finde by *Joannes Boemus*, that he that brought Godfathers firſt, brought in Infants-Baptiſm with it.

2. I finde that there was a time when there was a Canonical Sanction or Statute againſt it.

3. The coming in of Infant-Baptiſm, with the reaſon of it, *viz.* leſt any ſhould die without it, and the manner of it with God-fathers; and dipping not ſprinkling in the holy Font.

And this Mr. *Baxter* confeſſeth himſelf, in his third Edition of the *Saints Everlaſting Reſt*, part. 1. ch. 8. Sect 5 p. 179. in the Margin he ſaith, And in the Primitive times none were Baptized without an expreſs Covenanting, wherein they renounced the world, fleſh, and Devil, and engaged themſelves to Chriſt, and promiſed to obey him, as you may ſee in *Tertul. Origen, Cyprian*, and others at large, &c. This being a Truth, where is ground for Infant-Baptiſm, upon Mr. *Baxters* own confeſſion? So that theſe things thus conſidered, takes off all your probabilities, that *the Apoſtles did baptize Infants, and that it hath been a practiſe in the Church ever ſince; yet you confeſs immediatly, that ſome of the ancients*, pag. 89. *did perſwade men from baptizing Infants; yet ſay you, their diſſwaſions ſhew that their uſual practice was to baptize them.* I ſay, that it rather did ſhew that thoſe Ancients knew that it was but an invention of man, and that there was no ground for it in Scripture; elſe what need they to diſſwade them from it?

1. You ſay, S. *John died* 104. ſaith *Alſteed*; a likely or unlikely matter

matter; the *Psalmist* saith long before, a mans days were threescore and ten, &c. *John* died a 104 years after Christ; if this be likely, I leave all to judge. *Justin Martyr, you say, who lived in all probability*; It is but probability then, and very unlikely; for you say *he flourished about* 130. is this like to be in *Johns* days? all *John* days might be, nay must be, well near 200 years then; and all this you strain to draw down, if you could, Baptism of Infants from the Apostles; the sum of all is this, *Justin Martyr disputes the difference between infants who die baptized, and those who die unbaptized; he lived probably in S.* Johns *days, and knew the practise of the Apostle; but he lived* 130 *years after Christ; John must live so long too. or* 104 *at least, that so* Justin Martyr *might know Apostolick practise from* John: You mention others, as *Tertullian, Origen Cyprian, &c.* who mention baptizing of Infants; it may be they mention it as an Innovation: for Mr. *Baxter* saith expressly, as before, that they say there were none baptized in the Primitive times without an express Covenanting, &c. So you conclude that *Infants Baptism is no new invention, either of Pope or Devil; no man can shew what Pope or man invented it.*

Answ. 1. Christ never commanded it, the Apostles never practised it; that is evident, not only from the Scriptures silence, but Master *Baxters* confession; and then some *Pope, man or Devil* must invent it; and we are come very near the mark; you produce a History that saith *Pope* Higinus *brought in Godfathers:* I have mentioned another that saith Godfathers and Infant-Baptism came [illegible]ogether: and why not by the same Pope? you conclude, that you will *retort this upon the Anabaptists, that their practise is but a new invention, not above an hundred years old, &c.*

Answ. There is no truth in that: Baptizing of Believers is 1652 years *old, and that is many scores of yeers before your Infant-Baptism was invented:* and this Practise of the baptizing, and non baptizing of Infants, is that which hath been mentioned with much envy, almost in all Ages since the Primitive times; which notes, that there hath been some Witnesses to the truth in all Ages. About the year 1525. *Zuinglius* being busied about Reformation, there crept in the Heresie of the *Catabaptists*, who forbade the baptizing of Infants, and did rebaptize themselves. With these *Zuinglius* dealt friendly, at first disputing with them, and convincing them of their errours; but they being obstinate in their opinions, he caused the Senate severely to punish them, some with imprisonment some with

with death: this is recorded in a Book, intituled *Abel redivivus*, or *The dead yet ſpeaking*, pag. 92. And your own confeſſion, *That ſome Ancients diſſwaded from the baptizing of Infants, &c.*

The 20. *Objection* you mention, is,

That Baptizing is dipping.
But your Infants are not dipped.
Ergo, *They are not Baptized.*

You anſwer. 1. *That dipping is a thing indifferent, and not abſolutely neceſſary or eſſential to Baptiſm: there may be true Baptiſm, where there is no dipping, &c.*

2. Βαπτίζειν *to Baptize, is one thing, and* λούειν *to plunge over head and ears, is another, &c.*

Anſw. Its one and the ſame; for the word Βαπτίζω ſignifieth to dip as your ſelf confeſs, *pag.* 113. though not only to dip: you ſay the Primitive word Βάπτω *hath four ſeverall ſignifications:* 1. *To drownd, plunge or overwhelm,* 2. *To dye or dip.* 3. *To moyſten or make wet.* 4. *To waſh or cleanſe.* Note 1. It doth not by your own confeſſion ſignifie to ſprinkle: you have ſaid enough to ſatisfie any that deſireth ſatisfaction in this particular, that your Practiſe of ſprinkling, is not according to the Scripture; and in truth, ſprinkling is another word, and another thing then Baptizing; *Rantizo* is the Greek word for ſprinkling, and *Baptizo* from *Bapto* is the Greek word for Baptizing: take it in which of theſe four you pleaſe; neither of them is to ſprinkle; but in dipping, either of all the four is fulfilled; if dipped, then wet, then waſhed, then drowned or plunged; ſo that dipping is nothing ſhort of Baptizing, for the word ſignifieth it; its nothing beyond Baptiſm; for it is but a plunging, a wetting, or waſhing of the whole man: ſo that take in all the ſignifications of that word *Baptizo*, dipping anſwers them all; but ſprinkling anſwers neither; and in deed and truth, is not baptizing, but another thing, and that which *Chriſt* never commanded. Sprinkling a little water in the face is not a dipping or plunging, it is not a wetting or waſhing the whole man, and in no caſe anſwers the command of Chriſt.

But for the clearing of this particular, I ſhall give theſe

four grounds, to confirm dipping to be the true baptizing, and not ſprinkling.

1. From the ſignification of the word, as hath been already minded, it is the concluſion of all the Maſters of the Greek Tongue, in the Greek Lexicons, that the firſt, and moſt native, and proper ſignification of *Baptizo* is to dip or plunge into, or under water: and this your ſelf confeſſe, that 1. It ſignifieth to drown, plunge, overwhelm, die or dip; this Mr. *Lee* in his *Critica Sacra* on the word, and *Paſſor*, with divers others affirms, whom I ſuppoſe you conclude were Maſters of the Greek Tongue; and this likewiſe Doctor *Featly* in his *Dipper Dipt* confeſſeth; and this I finde, that the word *Baptizo* is never rendred in the New-Teſtament to ſprinkle, nor *Rantizo* to Baptize; therefore do no longer wreſt the truth contrary to your own knowledge, but be ſtill, and know that God is God.

2. From the Practiſe of the Servants of the Lord in the Primitive times, who beſt knew the minde of Chriſt: 1. *John* who was the *Meſſenger of Chriſt*, Mal.3.1. *Baptized*; *and he baptized in* Jordan, Mat.3.6. *And he baptized Chriſt himſelf in* Jordan, ver. 16. with Mark 1.9. *and he came up out of the water.* What need *Chriſt* and *John* go down into the water, if ſprinkling would do the deed? And the Text ſaith, *Mat.*3.13. *That Jeſus cometh to John to be baptized*, that is, upon Mr. *Hales* one account, to be plunged, dipped, wet, or waſhed, not ſprinkled, and being dip'd he was both wet and waſhed. And *Joh.*3.23. its ſaid, *That John was baptizing* (not ſprinkling) *in Enon neer Salim, becauſe there was much water there*; If ſprinkling had been the thing required, no need of much water. To this, you ſay, 1. *Water was ſcarce in thoſe hot Countries; that infers not a ſtripping naked, and plunging of all that were Baptized, but only the conveniency of baptizing a multitude, &c.*

Anſw. 1. Do you know, or have you heard of any ſuch hot Country, where there could not be water had enough to ſprinkle many thouſands, if need require? 2. Was *Canaan* ſuch a Country as that water was ſcarce in it, being the promiſed fruitfull Land in the whole world, a type of the *Heavenly Canaan*? where were *Wells digged*, *Deut.*6.11. *Neh.*9.25. and *Rivers in abundance*, or elſe the Type holds not correſpondence to the Antitype, *Ezek.*34.13 *Iſ.*12.3. Therefore for ſhame talk no more of a dry and hot Country; it being a Land of Rivers and Wells digged, &c. So that if a little water would have done it, as a little would have ſprinkled thouſands, they needed not

to

to have been baptized in *Enon*; ſo the word is not *at*, but *in Enon*; and ſo theſe ſeveral places tranſlated *With water*, *Mat.* 3.11. *Mark* 1.8. *Luk.* 3.6. *Iohn* 1.26. *Act.* 1.5. in the Greek it is rendred in every one of them *in water*; although you ſeem to hold forth that ἐν ſometimes ſignifieth *with*; yet the proper ſignification of ἐν is *in*, and is ſo underſtood and rendred twenty times in the New Teſtament againſt once *With*; that being the proper ſignification of the word, and moſt ſuitable to the Practiſe of the Apoſtles and ſervants of the Lord. Compare the former Scriptures with *Act* 8.38. and its clear they baptized in the water, not becauſe of the ſcarcity of water as you pretend, but becauſe there was much water, without which that Ordinance of dipping could not be adminiſtred. As for your Font-ſprinkling there is not the leaſt ſhadow of any ground for it in the Scripture; and whereas you ſay, *not a ſtripping naked, &c.* the Scripture mentions no ſuch thing, neither is it our Practiſe, nor yours neither. Do you uſe to ſtrip naked when you ſprinkle? neither do we when we baptize, &c.

2. You ſay, *Suppoſe the Apoſtles did dip thoſe whom they baptized, yet 'twill not follow therefore that we muſt do ſo too, becauſe tis only an example without a precept, and ſo doth not binde us, &c.*

Anſw. 1. There was the precept both to them and us. 2. they knew the will of him who gave the precept, and walked according to it, and we by their preſident know what the precept was, and ſo its a precept to us as well as them.

They lived in Judea in hot climates where was no danger of dipping &c.

Anſw. 1. And was there one way for them in *Judea*, and another for us in *England*? prove that by Scripture when you write next.

2. Was their Country ſo much hotter then ours? had they not Winter and Summer, heat and cold, froſt and ſnow, as we have? *Ioh.* 10.22. *Pſal.* 74.17. *Ier.* 36.22. *Pſal.* 148.8. Therefore give off this for ſhame likewiſe. Say no more their Country was hot, and ours cold. You ſay, *The danger of dipping in our cold Country, is, that many in our dayes have dyed.* If you intend the dipping of Believers, you ſpeak a horrid untruth: I am confident that never one periſhed in that way. But ſecondly, if you minde dipping of Infants, I know none are dipped. 2. If any be, no wonder if they periſh, being done out of Gods way having no warrant from him.

You confeſs Mr. *Perkins approves of dipping in hot Countries, and in men of years, but denies the uſe of it to Infants, becauſe of their health.*

Anſw. Firſt, is not this Country hot enough to Dip? they had winter

who dipped, as well as we; but no wonder if it be dangerous to the health of Infants; let it be administred to the right Subjects, *viz.* Believers, and you need not doubt of dipping. Whereas you question it *for sick and old folks*, pag. 115. I say there is no such necessity to Baptize such in Winter, *God will have mercy and not sacrifice*: let them stay till Summer; but take heed, change not the Ordinance from Dipping to Sprinkling; that is a dangerous thing. But you confess *pag.* 114. *That dipping is a lawfull manner of Baptizing*; in this you have confuted all you have said to this particular either before or after: For if dipping be a lawfull manner of Baptizing, then first sprinkling is unlawfull, for there is but one lawfull way of baptizing; the Scripture I am sure mentions no more, there is but one Baptism. 2. Then our dipping is lawfull. 3. You have done ill service in all you have said to render a practise so contemptible, which is as you confess in it self lawfull.

1. You say, *The Scripture cals sprinkling baptizing.*

Ans. No such thing: Let any examine the Scriptures you produce; see if you speak true or false. *Heb.* 9. 10, 13, 19, 21. You say, the word signifieth *washing* as well as *dipping*. *Ans.* Granted; but *sprinkling* is neither washing nor dipping.

2. *In Circumcision a little skin in one part only was cut off.*

An. That was done according to the command; so should Baptism, which is a dipping (as you confess) and we may not make our selves wiser then Christ, in inventing new wayes that he never required: therein we do indeed shew our pride, and are but fools.

3. *Washing, sprinkling, is a safer way, &c.*

Ans. 1. Sprinkling is not washing, but dipping is. 2. As to safety *in doubtfull cases*, I have answered already.

4. *Sprinkling is sufficient, because the thing signified is set forth by sprinkling, &c.*

Ans. There is no such thing: for though the blood of Christ be one thing signified in Baptism, yet there are other things signified in it; and yet sprinkling doth not reach this of the applying the blood of Christ so fully as dipping, which is a washing of the whole man; representing, that as truly as the whole body is washed by dipping in water, so those who are baptized upon the true account shal be wholly washed from not only the guilt of sin but from the filth and presence of it. Which shall be my 3. ground, that dipping, and not sprinkling is the true Baptism.

3. Be-

3. Becauſe the things ſignified are not ſo ſignificantly reſembled in ſprinkling as they are in baptizing, *viz.* in dipping. 1. As I have already ſaid, the whole waſhing away of ſin. 2. An outward conformity to Chriſt in his death, burial, and reſurrection; wherein is repreſented our ſpiritual death to ſin, and reſurrection to newneſs of life, *Rom.* 6. 3 4. 5. and this is not, cannot be reſembled by ſprinkling. And notwithſtanding you are pleaſed in way of reproach to ſay, *Then they muſt drown themſelves under Water, as Chriſt lay buried three dayes* &c. Note here, you ſay, *they muſt lie three dayes under Water*; yet before, you confeſs, *dipping* is a lawful way of baptizing.

You ſay, *Should you grant a neceſſity of this reſemblance and repreſentation; yet why may not ſprinkling repreſent it as well* &c?

Anſ. 1. I leave it to all rational men to judge, whether ſprinkling a little water in the face doth repreſent a death and burial with Chriſt, as well as a dipping into and under water. 2. I ſhall give you the Judgment of one approved and learned, Mr. *Tho. Goodwin*, in his *Support of faith from Chriſts reſurrection*, ch. 7. p. 54. He ſaith, *Rom.* 6. 3, 4. *We are ſaid to be* buried with him in baptiſm; *& Col.* 2. 12. Buried with him in baptiſm. *It is not ſimply ſaid, Like as he was buried, &c. but, Buried with him. So our communion and oneneſs with him in his reſurrection is repreſented to us therein, and not only our conformity or likeneſs unto him therein. And ſo Baptiſm repreſenteth this to us; that Chriſt having once in himſelf ſuſtained the perſons of all the elect in his burial and reſurrection; that now upon the party himſelf is perſonally, particularly, and apparently reacted the ſame part again in his baptiſm; thereby ſhewing what his communion with Chriſt before was, in what was done to Chriſt; that he then was buried with Chriſt, and roſe with him, and upon that ground is now in this outward ſign of Baptiſm, as in a ſhew or repreſentation, both buried, and alſo riſeth again.* Thus far *Tho. Goodwin.*

You ſay, *If dipping be true baptizing*, (which you have already granted, that dipping is lawfull baptizing; yet here you put an *if* to it, as if you had forgotten what you had ſaid before: but it's no wonder, for it is uſual with you) *then ſome that have been dipt by Popiſh Prieſts, have been rightly baptized.*

Anſ. We deny it: for though you have loſt the right way of doing it, as well as the ſubject, yet we do not ſay that thoſe Infants that are dipt are rightly baptized; becauſe you fail in the right ſubject, *viz.* Believers. Only we cannot but take notice of the juſt hand of

God in it againſt you; that having tranſgreſſed in taking Infants in ſtead of Believers, you ſhould change the very thing, and do another thing in ſtead of baptiſm, *viz.* ſprinkle; that ſo you might have the leſs to ſay in your own cauſe. Thus have you fulfilled that word, *Iſa.* 24.5. *Tranſgreſſed the Law, changed the Ordinances, broken the everlaſting Covenant*, applying it to the natural ſeed, when it belongs to none but the ſpiritual. How you will avoid that curſe, I know not.

You ſay, *It is the cuſtome and practiſe of all Reformed Churches to baptize by ſprinkling*, &c.

Anſ. What of that, if it contradict Scripture, which is the rule of Saints? You have confeſſed that dipping is a lawful baptizing; and there is but one lawful baptizing; therefore we muſt do that which is lawfull, though all people in the world do contrary.

The 4. ground why ſprinkling is not baptizing, is from the cuſtom retained from the Primitive times, as it is probable. And give me leave in this to conclude thus much; that I may much ſafer conclude this, it being ſo agreeable with the analogie of Scripture, then you can take up the whole practiſe upon that account. I ſay, Dipping in all Ages hath been the practiſe, (whether Believers or Infants.) The Hiſtory I mentioned before of *Joannes Boemus*, in the Manners and Cuſtoms of all Nations, *p.*159. *Infants were dipped in the holy Font.* In *Simpſons* Hiſtory of the Church, in the fourth Councel of *Toledo*, it was ordered that there ſhould be but one dipping in baptiſm, *p.*527. *An* 639. And the Church of *Rome*, from whence you came, retains by tradition Dipping: and Sprinkling is an innovation not of many years ſtanding in this Nation, as is well known; *Auſtin* when he came firſt into *England*, baptized in Rivers; in particular (as Hiſtory relates) he baptized ſome thouſands in a River neer *York*.

Thus have I given you a brief Anſwer to the material things in your *Guard*; I leave it to the conſideration of the Reader, and ſhall proceed to give you a brief Reply to your inveterate *Word* to *Collier*.

A Reply to *Thomas Hall.*

Sir,

YOu are pleaſed to write a *Word* to *Thomas Collier*, &c. A Love-letter; he that runs may read it. And indeed we did conclude before what we might expect from you, if the Lord gave you power according to your will. And I make no queſtion but what you have here written, will make the Magiſtrate the more ſenſible of what ſpirit you are, and will keep from you what you ſo much expect, *viz.* a Coercive power to compell or perſecute all that are contrary to you. And in what you have done, I believe you have more wounded your ſelf and your own intereſt, then either the truth or me; the Truth ſtanding pure in it ſelf, getting advantage by its enemies, though no thanks to them. And as for my ſelf, a poor weak and contemptible Creature, held forth in the hand of the Lord, and being upheld by Divine aſſiſtance, ſhall, I doubt not, but with joy paſs through good report and bad reportt, till I have finiſhed my courſe, and done the work whereunto I am appointed; accounting the reproach of Chriſt greater riches then the treaſures of *Egypt*, viz. Tythes.

You ſay, *I Colly every thing*; *Trinity*, *Scripture*, *Law*, *Goſpel*, &c.

Sir, you are miſtaken in it all, and ſo indeed have written forged falſhood, and ſent it abroad into the world. But I own and honour all theſe you mention, in their proper place, and according to the appointment of the Lord: and your ſelf it is who have been in the Black ſo long, that you Colly all, as will appear anon; and you will be the Hall, it ſeems, the ſtorehouſe which retains all blackneſs, darkneſs, &c. and from thence it cometh forth unto the reſt.

You ſay, I ſet my ſelf againſt the Anabaptiſts themſelves, whom I canonize for Saints in the higheſt form; yet blame them for adhering to Ordinances. Its very falſe, there is no ſuch word written; but it is for making too much of them, not for making uſe of them: And if ſome fail, is it not lawful to reprove? but *Thomas Hall* muſt raiſe an untruth and reproach upon it, change my words for his own ends.

I paſs your foul and filthy language, more fit for *Billinſgate* then the Preſs; and come to your particular Charges.

1. *An Heretick, and a Blaſphemer.*

To this purpoſe you mention the *Diſcourſe at Axbridge*, where Parſon *Smith* and Parſon *Carlile*, both Cavaliers, falſly ſwear,

1. That he denied Jeſus Chriſt to be the eternal Son of God.
2. He denied a local Heaven.
3. He denied the equality of the Son with the Father.
4. He denied that Jeſus Chriſt by his death upon the Croſs, did ſatisfie Divine Juſtice.
5. He denied the Trinity.
6. He affirmed that the Saints are the ſons of God in the ſame manner as Chriſt.
7. He affirmed that the Divine Eſſence was communicated to the Saints.
8. That the bodies of the Saints ſhould be turned into ſpirits.
9. That the Moral Law was aboliſhed.

Anſ. Were you not of the ſame blind and malicious ſpirit as thoſe two lying Parſons were, you durſt not call ſuch things Blaſphemies as were in truth by me maintained, and is apparent in the ſame Book or Diſcourſe.

1. I denied not the Eternity of Jeſus Chriſt, but the eternal generation in the Godhead, for which there is not one Scripture that ſpeaks the leaſt hint.

2. As to the locality of Heaven, that I ſaid, was, that God was not locally limited, &c.

3. The *Equality of the Son.* Quality and equality is proper only to man; there is no quality or equality in the Godhead; whatever is in God, is in him eſſentially, not as a quality. Its true, Chriſt as the *Meſſiah* is equal with God; but in the union of the Divine eſſence there is no quality nor equality, but union in eſſence, and eſſence in union.

4. For *Satisfaction to the Divine Juſtice*, I own it and have proved it (had you not been blind) upon the true account; it was the great end why Chriſt was inabled to the work, and ſent forth, that ſo he might

might ſatisfie the righteouſneſs and truth of the Father, which man could never do unto juſtification.

5. As to the Trinity, that is falſe likewiſe; it was the Trinity of Perſons, not the Trinity; that I own; but no Perſon in the Godhead, no Scripture ſaith it.

6. That the Saints are the ſons of God in the ſame manner as Chriſt, that is, in being made partakers of the ſame Spirit. *Rom* 8 9.

7. That the Divine Eſſence is communicated to the Saints; If the Spirit of Chriſt be in them then the Divine Eſſence is in them: But the Spirit of Chriſt is in them; Therefore the Divine Eſſence is in them: I do not mean the whole Eſſence, but a ſpark or influence of the Divine Eſſence.

8. That the bodies of the Saints ſhould be turned into Spirits; that I ſaid, was no other then what the Apoſtle ſaith; *they ſhall be raiſed with ſpiritual bodies.*

9. That the Moral Law was aboliſhed to Believers as a diſpenſation in the hands of *Moſes*; all this more at large might you ſee in the diſcovery of that Diſcourſe; but you were blinde it ſeems, and could not ſee afar off: But you manifeſt your minde; *Collier* it ſeems is in your way, you would fain have him burnt with his Books: What another *Bonner!* Will you juſtifie your Fathers in their wickedneſs, and ſo bring upon your ſelf all the righteous blood, ſhed from *Abel* to this day? but if the Lord hath ſo determined, I truſt in the ſtrength of the Grace of *Chriſt* my life and blood will be as ready to witneſs to the truth as my tongue and pen. I ſay no more about your Charge of Blaſphemy, but this, *After the way you call Blaſphemy and Hereſie, worſhip I the God of my Fathers.* And that ſeed you falſly and wickedly call *the Devils ſeed*, am I ſtill ſowing, and doubt not, but there will grow up ſuch a happy and bleſſed Harveſt, as will be to the honour of Truth, and joy of Saints, though to the grief and amazement of enemies and gain-ſayers. Mean while, go you on blaſpheming God, and them that dwell in Heaven; gnaw your tongue for pain, yet not repent of your deeds.

2. *You say he is a Lyar dyed in grain.*

You say, *You can prove him guilty of above a thousand lyes and errours, &c.* Was there ever the like lyar heard of in the world? What above a thousand lyes? yet mentions but 15. when he hath done all that he can; and these fifteen are most of them truth, by him falsely called lyes and errours; the rest of them Inventions falsely charged by him.

1. *That Infant Baptism came from the Pope and the Devil:* The truth of this assertion, I refer the Reader to what I have said before, and there you will see the Pope very probably that brought it in (*Higinus*) in the second Century, 150 years after Christ.

2. *That Christ hath abolished the Law*; that is, as to Believers as a dispensation in the hands of *Moses*; see 2 *Cor.* 3.11.13. *And the pure Gospel is the only Rule:* What son of *Belial* dare to deny this? for the Law is brought forth in Gospel; and as given forth by Christ, is the pure Gospel Rule, therefore though the substance of the old Command, yet is called new, because given forth upon the new and true account, 1 *Ioh.* 2 7, 8.

3. *A Socinian; his Tenet is that all gifted persons may preach without Ordination.* This is according to the truth of Scripture, 1 *Cor.* 4. 31.34. Where all that have gifts may prophesie, none exempted, except women.

4. *He is a Familist, approving of dreams, &c.*

Answ. That is false, I do not approve them; yet neither do I altogether deny but God may manifest himself in that way if he please; not that it is my experience; neither would I limit God. *Against Universities, Arts, Sciences*; not in themselves, upon the humane account; but as they are set up in the room of the Spirit of Christ, so *the wisdom of the world is foolishness with God.*

5. *He is an Antiscripturist, denying the truth of Scripture, &c.*

Answ. Another most abominable falshood; who will be the lyar anon *Thomas Hall*? but you prove it learnedly. 1. Because I approve of such, who will not permit you to draw any consequences from Scripture because you have so much abused them with your consequences. 2. Because minding some of your consequences, I conclude that they are as true as Scripture, if the people would but believe it.

You

You infer then that these consequences must be true, or the Scripture is false; I say, and I supposed that you had had wit enough to understand that I spake in your language, or in your sence, that you account these consequences as true as Scripture, if the people would believe you.

3. *He saith that in his general Epistle to the Saints,* chap.10.p.28. *the Scripure is not sufficient to teach the knowledge of God.*

I Query of any one who knows the Lord, whether the Scripture, without the Spirit of Christ, doth, or can teach any one true and saving knowledge; *and that some make too much of it,* that is, such as *Thomas Hall,* who think it able without the Spirit of *Christ* to teach the saving knowledge of *Jesus Christ*; and if you could have told all, you might have seen and said that I say there likewise, that many make too little of it; and that the substance of my Discourse there, is to hold forth the truth and authority of the Scripture in the light of the Spirit; that so souls by the teaching of the Spirit of Christ may come to a right understanding of them; and that indeed its your selves that truly teach people to deny Scripture. I own the truth of it, and say that whoever denieth it, must deny God, Christ and all Religion, and the truth is, that your self it is that disowns it, and reproacheth it too, further then it stands with your own will.

6. You say, *He is an* Arian *and* Anti-Trinitarian; *denyes the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are three distinct persons,*&c.

Answ. I deny not the Trinity, Father, Son, and Spirit; but I deny any person in the Godhead at all; that is a word or title given only to man; and the Scripture you mention, *Heb.*1.3. I am not altogether so ignorant of it as you would have me; it is substance and not Person; and this you know, and abuse it not ignorantly but wilfully. The same word, *Heb* 11.1. is rendred substance ὑπόστασις; faith is the substance of things hoped for, not the Person; that would be nonsense; you must produce some Scripture where that *Prosopon* which signifieth Person, is attributed to *God,* or that *Hypostasis* is attributed to man, before you can have any colour to call God three Persons, or one either; for he is a Spirit, *and will be worshipped in Spirit and Truth.*

7. *He is an Anti-Sabbatarian, he is all for a Spiritual Sabbath.*

Answ. Because I write of a spiritual Sabbath, doth it therefore follow that I am an *Anti-Sabbatarian*? have you ever seen any thing written by me against the Sabbath? have you not cause to blush at your weakness or wickedness? because I discover the spiritual Sab-

bath, therefore you ſay I am againſt the Sabbath.

8. *An Independent as to man and creatures (in the things of God) but only on Jeſus Chriſt*; and is this ſuch a dangerous thing, to be off from every thing ſave *Jeſus Chriſt*?

9. *A rigid Separatiſt.*

Anſw. Never too rigid in ſeparating from *Babylons* falſe ways and worſhips, which is no other then the Synagogue of *Satan*, a Cage of every unclean and hatefull Bird; I ſay it again, for all your anger, I muſt be faithfull, I may not pittie or ſpare you, for that will ruine you.

10. *A* Perfectiſt; *ſee his Generall Epiſt. to the Saints*, ch. 15. p. 52.

Anſw. No other then is the duty of every Saint to be, that is, preſſing after perfection; I there declare that perfection is not attainable in this life, till the body of fleſh is diſſolved, nor till the Reſurrection neither. I ſay no more of this, but refer the Reader to the Epiſtle it ſelf, where you may ſee how the *Hall* hath ſtored up lyes to reproach the innocent.

11. *He is an enemy to all Learning, he oft calls it the language of the beaſt, &c.*

Anſw. Keep it in its place, and do as much good as you can with it; but let it once get in the room of the Spirit, then it puffs up with pride, then its but the language of the Beaſt, of the fleſhly man; the ſmoak of the bottomleſs pit of mans wiſdom, and that which muſt be deſtroyed. *That the Spirit and Scriptures are ſufficient for the Miniſters calling*, &c. At this you ſeem to rage extreamly, as if this were ſuch a dangerous Hereſie that deſerves no leſs then a ſtake, a faggot, and a fire, could *Tho: Hall* have his will; let the Underſtanding judge. I am ſure, I have heard one of your brethren, more famous then ever your ſelf in the eyes of the people, aſſert this, that the Scripture was ſufficient for the Miniſters calling, &c. who left out the Spirit of Chriſt; but it ſeems your abilities depend upon your good old books, Popiſh Fathers, &c.

12. *He is againſt Magiſtrates.*

Anſw. No ſuch thing; only my deſire is, that Magiſtrates ſhould not rule, where its alone *Chriſts* Prerogative: I deſire to *give to Caſar that which is his, and to God that which is his.*

13. *Againſt Miniſtry.*

Anſ. Not againſt the Miniſtry of Chriſt; but of the World and of *Antichriſt.*

14. *He*

14. *He reproacheth the Army, making them all Independents and Anabaptiſts.*

Anſ. Its a great untruth to ſay I make them all ſo: that I ſay, is, that thoſe whom you falſely call *Anabaptiſts* and *Independents* are the Inſtruments by which God hath given a being to you and the Nation: I deny not what was done by any at firſt; but I know not how it would have been at laſt, if God had not raiſed up the Spirits of ſome to ſtand in the gap; and your ſelves had like to have been the great Inſtruments for ſelf-ends to have drawn on ruine, had not the Lord prevented.

15. *He diſhonoureth and abuſeth the preſent Power, by Dedication of an abſurd, Heretical, Blaſphemous, non-Licenſed Pamphlet, called a Diſcourſe at* Axbridge.

Anſw. I do affirm that none dare give ſuch vile titles to ſuch apparent truths, but thoſe whoſe eyes are blinded, and whoſe hearts are hardned, filled with all enmity againſt the truth of *Jeſus Chriſt*: I refer thoſe who deſire further ſatisfaction, to the diſcourſe it ſelf.

And truly we had need appeal to the Authority of the Nation for a civill preſervation, it being our Birthright; there being ſo many of your generation, men of blood, that will ſay, nay ſwear blaſphemy, Hereſie, any thing, that ſo you might be rid of us.

Finally, I ſay no more to all your perverſe and raging accuſations, but the Lord rebuke thee.

Some few *Queries* preſented.

1. Query. *Whether or no in all that* Tho. Hall *hath ſaid, he hath in any caſe anſwered the Pulpit-Guard-Routed, or relieved his own Guard?*

2. Qu. *Whether or no all that* Tho. Hall *hath ſaid in his* Font-Guard *doth amount to ſo much as either a Precept or Preſident for his Practiſe?*

3. *Whether or no (if not) his Practiſe in ſprinkling Infants be not Will-Worſhip?*

4. *Whether the upholding of an outward Covenant, and a natural Seed in that Covenant, be not to deny Chriſt to be come in the fleſh?*

5. *Whether or no there be any Seed in the days of the Goſpel accounted for the Seed but the Spiritual; all the Promiſes made to* Abraham *being diſſolved into Chriſt, coming forth from him to the Spiritual Seed; none being accounted the children of Abraham, but thoſe that do the works of Abraham?*

6. *Whether or no* Tho. Hall, *tells true or falſe, when he ſaith, he will*

prove

prove Tho. Collier *of above a thousand lyes, and can name but fifteen upon his own account.*

7. *Whether or no, in those fifteen he mentions being rightly considered as before,* Tho. Hall *be the lyar, or* Tho. Collier?

8. *Whether* Tho. Hall *have spoken true or false in these things following?* 1. *In asserting, that none ought to preach the Gospel but men in Office.* 2. *In saying, there is both precept and president for Baptizing Infants, when he can produce neither.* 3. *In saying that the Covenant of the Law is the same as the Covenant in the Gospel, when the Scripture saith the contrary,* Isa.31.31. *Heb.*8. 4. *In saying, that baptizing Infants is a tradition from the Apostles, when he cannot prove the Apostles baptized any.* 5. *In saying that sprinkling is baptizing, when they are two things.* 6. *Whether the bringing in of all the People into an outward Covenant and form of Godliness, without the power, be not the way of delusion and confusion?* 7. *Then whether the Leaders of the People do not cause them to erre?*

A Word of REPLY to *John Ferriby*, in an Appendix to *The Lawfull Preacher*: called *The Pulpit-Guard-Relieved.*

SIR, You call your Appendix *The Pulpit Guard Relieved*; But whether it be A Relief in good earneſt, I leave to the Reader to judge. If chiding, railing and reproaching be A Relief, then you have Relieved it; elſe not. And notwithſtanding your great ſwelling words, you'l find there is ſo much in that *Pulpit-Rout*, that neither you nor all your Gang will ever be able to extinguiſh it. Rage you may, but ruin it you cannot.

You ſay *Page* 2. That *he is ſo bitter in his Expreſſions againſt the Gentleman, ſo loud in railing againſt the Coat, that he deſerves no Anſwer.* But you are miſtaken, Sir; they are not railings, but true diſcoveries of Wolves in Sheeps cloathing.

But you ſay, *You forbear, leſt in this the Proverb ſhould be verified, Like to like, quoth the Devil to the Collier.* And who is worſt think you, the Devil or the Collier? By your own confeſſion you are the Devil, I the Collier. The Devil it is, it ſeems, ſpeaks to the Collier; and ſurely if the Collier did the Devils work, he would never reprove him for it. But if the Collier do the work of Chriſt, the Devil will fall upon him.

You ſay *You will not meddle with the Looking-glaſs: nor will you examine the Tryal and Verdict, nor take notice of the ſtrength of his Arguments.*

I wonder what then you will do; here's like to be a goodly Relief anon; *A Pulpit Relief*, yet take no notice of the force of the Truth that lieth againſt it. It's juſt like to a company of men that will pretend they relieve a beſieged Gariſon, yet take no notice of the Beſiegers, or will ſtand at a diſtance, and give great words, and ſo go away boaſting that the Work is done; and the mean time the Beſieged periſh. Thus have you dealt with your *Pulpit-Guard*; And truly, had not I had other occaſions to write, I had never troubled my head or pen to have given you a word of Anſwer; And in this I ſhall give you but a word or two.

Thus having ſhifted your ſelf from the ſubſtance of what is ſaid in

The

The Pulpit Guard-Rout you pretend to give a Glympſe of his *skill in the interpretation of Scripture.*

The Firſt is that of the Prieſts of the Law and the Miniſters of the Goſpel.

The Prieſthood under the Law typed out Chriſt, and he is the alone Prieſt by office. I deny not Miniſters by office under the Goſpel; but that Miniſtry that is of Chriſt, never forbiddeth the preaching of the Brethren (who have received the Gift, though they never meddle with the office) but rather encourageth to it. 1. *Pet* 4. 10,11.

And it is a truth, that *Corah's* guilt was in doing that which was forbidden; but the Saints are Commanded to, and Commended for preaching. Commanded to it *Rom.* 12.3,6. 1*Cor.*14 31.1 *Pet.*4. 10. Commended for it 1*Cor.*11.2. One Ordinance or Tradition, and that not the leaſt too, was that they might, nay that they ought to bring their gifts to the Church for the good of the whole. There are diverſities of gifts in the Church, and all for the good of the whole. 1*Cor.*12. And this Monopolizing ſpirit that hath ſo long reigned in thoſe who call themſelves Miniſters, hath been the cauſe of ſo much blindneſs in the World as hath been almoſt to this day. And as for the Calling of the Worldly Miniſtry, I leave the Reader to what is wrtten in *The Pulpit-Guard Routed*, to conſider whether it be from above or from beneath, &c.

You ſay *Page* 5. *There is in my Book*, Page 19. *enough granted for your Purpoſe.*

Tis becauſe you do in this as in other things take but Part of what I ſay. For though I ſay that none can preach according to the intention of that Scripture *Rom.*10.15. for the working of Faith and Converting of ſouls; yet it doth not follow that every Gifted Brother may not Preach.

But you leave out that which follows. *viz. for every Gifted Brother is ſent to preach according to the meaſure of the Gift recieved.* And the Miſtake lieth in the word *ſent*, thinking that none but men in Office are ſent of God to convert ſouls; when Gifted Brethren are ſometimes ſent though not in Office. Acts 8. 4. with11.19,21.

All you ſay in Anſwer to that *that gifting is ſending &c* reacheth not the buſineſs in hand. For

1. It doth not appear in thoſe Scriptures you mention, *Iſa.*6 8,9. *Mat.*10 1,5. that they were firſt gifted, then ſent; Go tell them ſaith

ſaith the Lord to *Iſaiah*. Gods putting the word in his mouth, was the gifting. Yet

2. I deny not in the ordinary way of propheſying and preaching gifting to precede ſending, firſt to thoſe who are authoritatively ſent by the Church; or ſecondly to thoſe who preach only by gift according to the meaſure of the gift received. It is ſending; and they may and ought according to the meaſure of the gift, both in the Church and out of the Church, *viz.* in the world as occaſion is offered, God in thoſe occaſions calling them to it, accordingly to adminiſter.

Secondly you ſay, that *he is very unhappy in confounding ordinary and extraordinary Caſes.*

I anſwer firſt, that extraordinary Caſes make not that lawfull which in it ſelf is unlawfull, unleſs in caſes of neceſſity for preſervation of life: then *I will have mercy, and not ſacrifice*: unleſs it be in the bearing up of the name and truth of Chriſt; then *he that will ſave his life, ſhall loſe it.* Witneſs *Uzzah* 1 *Chro.* 13.9.10. for putting his hand to ſtay the Ark, was ſmote with death. So that your ſo often mentioning extraordinary caſes helps you nothing; for its not the extraordinarineſs of the caſe that juſtifies the thing, if it be in it ſelf unlawfull; ſo that you do indeed condemn the practice of the Saints recorded in Scripture for our example, in *Acts Chap.* 8. and 11. with divers others; and all for the keeping up your own Ends and Intereſts. I am ſure if you ſtood in the counſel and truth of Jeſus, the preaching of the Brethren could not, would not trouble you.

As for what is ſaid from *pag.* 8 to 10. I refer the Reader to the clearneſs of the aſſertions in my Book.

Pag. 9. You ſay, *The Gentleman* (Pretended Servants; for ſo the word *Miniſter* ſignifies; yet Gentlemen Maſters, Servants ruling over their Maſters) *having ſaid that the Holy Ghoſt commends Learning, he Replyes*, pag. 41. *Holy Ghoſt! is there any ſuch word in the Scripture as Ghoſt?* You ſay *How now! which way went the Spirit of God from him? what, immediately inſpired, yet ignorant of this? hath he forgotten Mat.* 28.20. *&c?*

Anſ. Nay Sir, he hath not quite forgotten it; but have you indeed forgotten? or elſe did you never learn it that πνεῦμα ſignifiyeth *ſpirit*, not *ghoſt*? and ſo it is tranſlated and read in all other languages except the Engliſh; and ſometimes its truly tranſlated in Engliſh too: and the word *ghoſt* is an old Engliſh Popiſh ugly word, which indeed if rightly conſidered, is not ſo fit to be given to the Holy Spirit.

As for the interpretation of I. *Cor.*14:31.32. *Let the ſpirits of the Prophets be ſubject to the Prophets*; though I deny not what is mentioned *v.*29. that the Prophets ſpeak two or three, and the others judge; for the Church is to judge of the doctrine taught in it; yet its evident to any whoſe eyes are not ſhut againſt the truth that the interpretation of *v.*31 &;32 is in *v* 33 *for God is not the author of confuſion, but of peace* See his Brother *Richard Sanders* confuting this, in his *Balm to heal religious wounds*, pag.202. he ſaith, *The ſpirit of the Prophets was ſubject to the Prophets*, that is, the Spirit of Propheſie was not ſo violent on them, but that they had power to contain themſelves, and to ſtay one for another, and ſo to ſpeak in order, &c. Here *Richard Sanders* confutes *John Ferriby*; let the Reader judge.

As to what you ſay in the reſt, in way of Reply, there being no weight at all in it, I paſs by it, referring the Reader to the examination of that Book you pretend to Anſwer. Where I make no queſtion, but that the clearneſs of the truth aſſerted, will appear to the ſatisfaction of any unbyaſſed and impartial Reader.

As for your reproachfull terms, which is indeed the ſum of all your Anſwer, I paſs it by as unworthy taking notice; leaving the controverſie betwixt both you and us unto the righteous Judge, who will in his own time bring it forth to the light, and put a difference between thoſe who ſerve the Lord *Jeſus*, and thoſe who ſerve their own bellies. To him and with him I leave the controverſie, who undoubtedly will plead his own Cauſe and Truth in his own Time.

An

AN ANSWER

To a Book written by one *Richard Sanders* of *Kentiſhbeer*; entituled, *A Balm to heal Religious wounds*. Called,

An Anſwer to the *Pulpit-Guard Routed*; written by *Thomas Collier*.

SIR,

MEeting with your Book, the Title beſpeaks what I find not in it. 1. You call it *A Balm to heal Religious wounds*, &c. But when I came to take a view of it, I found it far from the nature of its name; but it rather tends to make the wounds deeper, and the breach wider: your book being ſtuffed with as much rancor almoſt in every page as any I have read, except *Tho. Halls* who writ the *Pulpit* and *Font Guards*. So that if what you ſay of mine were a truth, you have ballanced it on the other hand down to the ground, *viz.* with reproachful terms: and as for that you call harſh language in mine, it is no other then what hath been given by the ſervants of the Lord in Scripture upon the like occaſion.

2. You call it, *An Anſwer to the Pulpit-Guard Routed*. Two open and cleer untruths in the Title. Firſt, *A Balm to heal Religious wounds*; when it is far from it. Secondly, *An Anſwer to the Pulpit-*

Guard Routed; when you ſcarce come ſo neer as to meddle with it, unleſs with railing and reproachful terms; and if that be a ſufficient anſwer, you have done it to the purpoſe: Or ſecondly, in paſſing by the material and ſubſtantial things, you have culled out ſome few particular things, calling them *Colliers* Errors, when they are undoubted truths, unleſs thoſe which are abuſed by you, changing the terms in which by me they were aſſerted; as will appear in its place.

I paſs your Epiſtle, and come firſt to your five ſerious Queſtions.

1. Qu. *Whether ſuch an uncharitable, cenſorious, proud, diſdainfull, inveterate, calumniating ſpirit as works in this man (and others of the ſame lump) doth ever ſhew it ſelf in Scripture?*

Anſ. 1. If not, then you have declared your ſelf to be as far from the ſpirit of a Chriſtian upon the ſame account, as the *Collier* whom you ſo much reproach: witneſs this very queſtion propounded and almoſt every page in your book witneſſeth it; but I deſire not to ſcrape them up together.

And ſecondly, The truth of thoſe titles mentioned by you *pag.* 6. I leave to the Reader to judge; and if I am become your enemy for telling you the truth, I am contented through mercy to paſs under your cenſure.

Your 2. queſt. *Upon what ground (think you) ſhould he and men of the ſame temper and ſpirit with him, uſe ſuch bitterneſs againſt the Miniſtery, &c.?*

Anſ. 1. We never uſed ſuch bitterneſs againſt the Miniſtery of the Nation, as they have againſt us. We never deſired to get an Ordinance from both Houſes of Parliament, to have them burnt in the forehead with the letter *B.* to have them impriſoned without Bail or Mainprize, &c. Though this is no ground to retort bitterneſs again in way of revenge, but rather to pitty them.

2. It is not their perſons, but their deſtructive Principles againſt which I write: the Lord who knoweth all things, knoweth that I lye not. I ſhould rejoyce in their converſion; and do not queſtion but that there are many that are honeſt and godly of them yet in *Babylon*; and their duty is to come forth: and till then, blame us not for our dealing faithfully, though ſometimes ruggedly with them. And I would have you to know, that it is not a power to perſecute them we look for; no, I had a thouſand times rather *Thomas Halls*

deſire

deſire were granted to him, that I with my books were burnt together, then to have a hand in the perſonal perſecution of *Tho. Hall*, your ſelf, or any other, for any principle or practiſe you hold in Conſcience, though it be known to me that it is contrary to truth.

Your 3. Queſt. *Whether this open enmity againſt the Miniſtery of* England, *which theſe men proclaim to all the World, inveighing againſt them as Antichriſtian, be not a thing abhorred of all gracious hearts?* For proof of this you produce Mr. *Tho. Goodwyn*, Mr. *Philip Nye*, Mr. *Sidrach Simpſon*, Mr. *Jeremiah Burroughs*, Mr. *William Bridge*. *Apol. Nar.* p 6.

Anſ. The honeſty of theſe men I queſtion not: Yet firſt, what they ſay proves not the truth of what you deſire; for it is not the teſtimony of men, but of God in the Scripture, that will juſtifie both Miniſtry and Church. And if that would do it, I could produce others of the ſame way, (I ſuppoſe none will deny but that they were equal with them for godlineſs and learning) who ſay the contrary. *Ainſworth*, *Smith*, *Robinſon*.

You ſeem to propound a ſtrange Querie, *pag.* 14. *Whither would theſe men tranſport and carry you? Not only off from Presbytery, but Independents, &c.*

Anſ. In the light and power of truth, we would carry them to the Lord Jeſus; that ſo they might know and obey him, and worſhip the Father in him in ſpirit and in truth: and this is the utmoſt that we deſire.

And truly, this is that which is my principle and practiſe, 1. That we are juſtified freely by grace; And 2. that this Juſtification where it is in truth enjoyed, works over ſouls to a holy and humble walking with the Lord, and obedience to him in all things. That it is the duty of Believers, according to the command of Chriſt, and practiſe of his ſervants in the Primitive times, to be baptized, and ſo come into Church fellowſhip, walking as with the Lord, ſo one with another in love, performing all duties of brotherly love, as becometh ſouls made one in ſo high and heavenly a calling. And hither it is we would tranſport and carry every ſoul that knows the Lord; and this is a journey, that you who call your ſelves *Miniſters*, cannot endure to undertake, nor ſuffer thoſe that would.

Your 4. Queſtion is, *Were ſuch things heard of in former times among the old Puritans? &c.*

Anſ. They were not ſenſible of thoſe deluſions in that way which

now appear; and many of them are made ſenſible of it, and are departed from it; Gods people cannot but depart out of *Babylon*, when once they ſee themſelves there, and hear the Lords voice ſaying, *Come out of her my people; partake not of her ſins, leſt you partake of her plagues.* Thoſe that have ſeen themſelves in *Babels* confuſion, in reſpect of worſhip; being delivered, cannot but diſcover and lay open to others the myſterie of that iniquity, though all the men and Miniſters of the world diſlike it, &c.

Your 5. Queſtion. *Hath it not been an old trick of ſuch as have deſigned the ſhaking of the Chriſtian faith, firſt to begin with the faithfull Miniſters,* &c?

A. Though it hath been the deſign of the enemies of truth ſo to do; yet, 1. That juſtifies not you to be the godly Miniſters. And 2. The ſervants of the Lord may not neglect their duty in reproving ſin where they find it, becauſe enemies to truth oppoſe the Miniſters of Chriſt. And 3. We give grounds from Scripture for what we ſay and do. Juſtifie your ſelves to be the Miniſters of Chriſt by your works according to Scripture, and we have done: till then, forbear giving ſuch language as you do to the ſervants of the Lord for their impartial publiſhing and profeſſing of truth. You'll one day be aſhamed of it.

So you ſay you come to his Errors, which are many.

His firſt Error.

That the life of Miniſters and Schollers educated in Schools of Learning, is an idle life.

Anſ. 1. There are no ſuch words in my book; neither is there any truth in what you ſay: but that which I ſay, is, that God hath always in all ages made uſe of men of Callings to be the Miniſters of his mind unto the people; and I deſired you to produce any example in the Scripture, that God made choice of any to be the Miniſters of his mind unto the people, who were bred up idly all dayes of their life without a Calling.

I do not ſay that the life of the Miniſters of Chriſt is an idle life; no, I know the contrary: but that which I ſay, is, that you can produce no example of any that were bred up idly without a Calling, called to be Miniſters: yet you will have Idlers, and none but them by your wils; and God muſt have them, or elſe he muſt have none at all. You ſay, to confirm this, he ſayes, *A Calling is that in and by which men in the ſweat of their face get their living.*

You

You anſwer, *O brave definition of a Calling, &c.*

Anſ. I wonder you had not fallen foul with the Scripture, and have blamed him that commanded it; but you are ſo wiſe and honeſt as to leave out the Scriptures that I grounded my definition upon. *Gen* 3. 19. *In the ſweat of thy face ſhalt thou eat bread till thou return to the duſt.*

Query. *Doth the Lord here intend, that ſome men muſt eat bread in the ſweat of their faces, and others muſt live idle?*

The other Scripture, is Eph. 4. 28. But you Anſwer. 1. *Is every thing a man doth get a living by, a lawfull calling; then he that ſweats by robbing and ſtealing, lives by a lawfull calling, &c.*

Anſw. It ſeems you have a minde to quarrell againſt the Truth; becauſe the word (*lawfull*) is not put in, you will conclude Robbery is lawful. do not you diſcover ignorance or wilfulneſs, quarrelling againſt the very plain words of the Scripture, which ſaith, *In the ſweat of thy face, thou ſhalt eat thy bread, &c.* he doth not ſay, in the lawfull ſweat of thy face; but that is implyed in the words; ſo when I ſay in the ſweat of mens face they ſhould get their bread, its intended lawfully; not by robbing and ſtealing; and truly you manifeſt your ſelf to be no friend to Truth in drawing ſuch a concluſion from ſuch clear and undeniable premiſes: I am confident never a Robber in this Nation durſt to have drawn ſuch a concluſion from ſuch undoubted truth and Scripture.

2. You ſay, *Is there no lawfull Calling but that whereby a man gets his living in the ſweat of his face? what will you ſay then of Magiſtrates, Juſtices of the Peace, &c.*

Anſw. They are not bred up Juſtices of the Peace, but are, or ſhould be bred up in ſome Calling: I am ſure the Scripture allows of idleneſs in none, though there may be a difference in labour; yet I ſuppoſe that leſs then this ſhould not be in the breeding of the greateſt mens children in the Nation, to be able to do things of Husbandry, that ſo they may be able to manage their eſtates the better, and know themſelves when their buſineſs is well done.

And ſo they may be the better fitted for their Calling, as Magiſtrates, Juſtices of the Peace, &c.

You ſay, *Will he call the Parliament Idlers, &c.*

Alas man! he knows the Parliament is a particular Calling while it continues, the Members of it being called and ſent up by the Country, and they being faithfull in it ſerve the Country.

As

As for *Physitians*, I question not their Calling; that relates unto the body; but there is a difference between a Physitian of the body and of the Soul; the one is natural, therefore needs time of study to finde out the natural Causes and Remedies: and I question not the lawfulness of breeding to School till men are fit for those Callings to which they are appointed; but the Calling of the Minister is not a natural Calling, but a Spiritual; and only God fits and enables to it; therefore for men to live out of a Calling to fit themselves for the Ministry, is a very corrupt and dangerous thing; for in conclusion they must be Ministers right or wrong; they were bred up unto it; they expect a maintenance from it, &c. Whereas the Ministers of Christ have ever been chosen upon another account; *viz.* God gives gifts, and the Church chooses, and they are called from one Calling to another, yet may lawfully live in the use of both.

Then you say, *Taylors, Button-makers, Seamsters, &c. because they do not sweat at it, especially in the Winter, are not lawfull Callings.*

Alas man! blindness with a witness; if you quarrell so much with the word, *sweat*, why do you not quarrell against him who first commanded it? But do you not know, first, that there is no Calling, but that sometimes those implyed in it may, nay, do *sweat*. 2. That the word, *sweat*, primarily relates to a mans diligence in his Calling, being imployed about something that may administer to his necessity, according to the Scripture, so not living idly;

3. You say, *Is it so, that none live in a lawfull Calling, but he that works with his hands? what think you of* Paul, 1 Cor. 9. 6. *have not We power to forbear working, &c.*

Answ. 1. I did not, nor do not affirm that those who are the Ministers of Christ, lawfully called, &c. may not forbear working; but that they ought not to be bred up idle, till they are called; and that God always maketh choice of men of particular Callings. 2. That *Paul* might forbear work, not that he must do it; for he did work, *His hands ministred to his necessities, for the Gospels sake.* I wonder when we shall finde any of you Ministers of the Nation in that temper?

4. You say, *Is there no laboriousness and pains taking in the imployment of the Ministry, &c.*

Answ. I know there is; and notwithstanding you say, *that it appears by his book, he is not acquainted with the labour of the minde in getting down*

down to the bottom of things. Sir, I have through grace gone ſo to the bottom of things, as hath and will root up all your Religion, root and branch, Miniſtry, Church, Ordinances and all; therefore forbear complaining of the want of going to the bottom of things; and I doubt not but that I ſhall go to the bottom of your Book too, before I have ended.

But you ſay he adds, *Breeding to School is proper to children when they cannot labour, to fit them for ſome Calling.*

You pretend, *That Infants are able to labour almoſt aſſoon as they are able to go to School, &c.*

Anſw. 1. If you were not ignorant at beſt, or envious, you might underſtand that Infants are not able to labour in their Callings aſſoon as able to go to School; and I dare affirm, that there is time enough for children to get Learning to fit them for any Calling in this Nation, before they have ability of body to perform it. I do not judge children ſufficiently capable in body for a Calling untill 14. years of Age, and here is time enough for children to get Learning; as for Univerſities, we read of none in Scripture; and *Simſon* in his *Hiſtory of the Church* ſaith. that *Clemens Alexandrinus*, and *Pantenus* were the Authors of Univerſities and Colledges, p. 259.

2. I ſay, That children may be fit for ſome Callings before they be for others; and according as the Calling is unto which they are intended, may their Parents give the time of breeding them, ſome more, and ſome leſs, untill fit and able to manage that Calling unto which they are appointed; yet all this makes nothing at all for the breeding up of Miniſters, unleſs you will make a Trade of it; which I perceive is the great Work you are about. When men are thus bred up and fitted for, and imployed in ſome lawfull Calling, if God now manifeſt his Son to and in ſuch a one, inabling him to the Work of the Lord in his own heart, and in the judgement of the Church, he may lawfully, nay he ought to ſubmit unto the Call of God, be he high or low; from the Speaker of the Houſe, or Preſident of the Counſell of State, unto the Hewer of wood and Drawer of water; and this is a true Call, when thus called of God: therefore all you ſay to this, is but an idle fancy; you have no ground for it.

His ſecond Error.

That Infant-Baptiſm is a childiſh thing.

And this you ſay, *He will own for a Truth:* And this I do ſay, I

ſtill own for a Truth, and that firſt in *the Subject.* 2. *In the Adminiſtrators.*

You ſay, *There is an Objection lies in the way, which he ſets down,* viz. *That the Infants of the children of Iſrael were as uncapable of the underſtanding of the myſterie of Circumciſion, as Infants are now of Baptiſm.*

My Anſwers (though reproached by you, I ſuppoſe its not for want of ignorance) (I ſhall relate them again, and leave them to the judgement of the Reader; only, adding one more) will ſtand, and their truth be manifeſt, when what you practiſe will fall in the ſtreets.

Its truth, that one part of Circumciſions Myſtery, *viz.* the Circumciſion of the heart, was as far from the capacity of Infants, as the myſterie of Baptiſm is now.

2. As Circumciſion was a Type and Figure in the fleſh of Chriſt, who was to come of *Abrahams* Seed; and there was no ſuch capacity required, becauſe it was a *Jewiſh* Legal Type, as all the reſt of their external Worſhips and Sacrifices were, leading to, and repreſenting the coming of *Chriſt* in the fleſh. *That theſe are not words to pleaſe children as you pretend, unleſs you mean the children of God*; but words of truth, it will appear, if the honeſt Reader do but conſider; that as all the Ordinances of the *Jews* were Carnal and Typical, *Heb.* 9. 10. *Col.* 2. 16, 17. So thoſe Ordinances were given to the Natural or Carnal Seed, *viz.* the Seed of the Fleſh, which was Typical likewiſe as their Ordinances were; therefore was not the like capacity required in them, as in thoſe in the Goſpel days, who are directly led into the Myſterie unto *Jeſus* who is come, being the ſubſtance of all thoſe Types and ſhadows.

3. There was a Command for that of Circumciſion; none for that of Baptiſm: you cry out, *O egregiouſly gifted Diſputant!*

Anſw. O egregiouſly ignorant! Is it not the Command that gives a capacity to the one and to the other? If the Lord Command the one, and not the other, is not that enough to ſilence man for ever? *Zac.* 2. 13. I ſay its the Command of God that gives a capacity to the creature of obeying; and there are none capable of a Duty but thoſe that are called to the Duty; and this you confeſs your ſelf, p. 86. that in weighty things of God, a Chriſtian muſt have a certain evident Rule to warrant his practiſe. Whereas you ſay, *They were therefore circumciſed, becauſe taken into the Covenant, and ſo Church Members*; I ſhall Anſwer it in its place, and ſay ſomething to it in my fourth Anſwer.

I ſhall adde a fourth, and that is, They were capable of thoſe things promiſed to them in that Covenant, viz. *The Land of Canaan*; and only the ſpiritual ſeed are capable of thoſe things promiſed in the Goſpel-Covenant, viz. The ſpiritual Land, Jeſus Chriſt, and all the good things of the Goſpel.

2. I ſay its childiſh, as relating to the Adminiſtrators, &c. and you give a clear anſwer to it of juſt nothing. I refer the Reader to it.

His third Error.

That none muſt be baptized until they come to perfect age.

To this you ſeem to give a learned Anſwer, crying out of *Ignorance*; and where it is, let the Reader judge by the Scriptures I produce: Was not Chriſt himſelf baptized at thirty years of age? The Eunuch by *Philip*? Acts 8.37. And thoſe that came to *Iohn*? Mat.3. and thoſe Acts 2. 40, 41?

You ſay, *When any Anabaptiſt in England can prove that there was no Infants baptized in the Apoſtles time, then it may be you will make uſe of that which I bring.*

I ſhall make uſe of your own words before: *O egregiouſly gifted Diſputant!* What, are you ſo well verſt, that we muſt prove Negatives? I thought that you had known ſo much in diſputation, of Reaſon and Scripture, that if you will practiſe a thing, then you muſt prove it, or elſe it is Will worſhip; if you can produce no precept nor preſident in Scripture for your practiſe, then you have no ground for your practiſe; but you can produce neither precept nor preſident for your practiſe. *Ergo.*

I ſay, *Is there one rule for them, and another for us now? if there be, produce it.*

To this you learnedly anſwer: *If he did underſtand ſenſe, he would ſee that the ſame Scripture rule that was then given to the Churches, directs us to a different courſe in gathering of Churches.*

And truly I muſt be mighty wiſe then to underſtand that which is not for mine own ends; ſuch ſenſe will prove ſenſual in the end, *Jam.* 3. 13, 14, 15, 16. and this is the ſumme of what you ſay; only you would flatter the people with your love to them; and its manifeſt it is in darkening the Truth. You have produced no Scripture for another rule to us, then that to them, although I called for it, but only Rev. 2. 2. *Try them that ſay they are Apoſtles, and are not, but lyars.* I ſay ſo too, and earneſtly deſire, nay charge thoſe who have any know-

ledge of Jeſus, to do it. See who ſticks faſteſt to the Scriptures, we or you, that ſo they may find out the lyars, and detect and avoid them; for they ſerve not the Lord Jeſus, but their own bellies, and by their works they ſhall know them.

As for thoſe conſequences mentioned; as that of Circumciſion, the Houſholds, and thoſe brought to Chriſt, &c. I wonder that you bluſh not to write ſo audaciouſly as you do, knowing that almoſt all people know the truth of what I write; that theſe are the conſequences, witneſs *The Font-Guarded.*

Immediatly you confeſs, that its true, *The firſt conſequence is made uſe of*; but come hither all you that fear the Lord, ſee what a ſhift this man makes to help himſelf; he takes it for granted, that I acknowledge that baptiſm is come in the room of Circumciſion: when I do but declare your falſe and nonſenſical conſequences, not mine own concluſion. I deny Baptiſm to be come in the room of Circumciſion; my grounds you may ſee in the *Font-Guard Routed*, in my anſwer to Doctor *Hall*; yet if it were true, that Baptiſm were come in the room of Circumciſion, as *Richard Sanders* would have it, let the babes and ſucklings come and ſee what ground here will be for Infant-baptiſm: let Jeſus Chriſt be King, let him have but ſo much honour, as to tell you who ſhall be baptized, and how it ſhall be done, the controverſie will be ended: *If you think Chriſt as a Son to be faithful in his houſe, as Moſes a Servant was faithful in his houſe*, Heb. 3. 2, 3, 4, 5. then he hath left ſufficient rules for his people to walk by; they need not leave the ſon, and go back to the ſervant, *Act.* 2. 22. but you ask *What he hath to ſay to this conſequence? Why the Law came by Moſes; Grace and Truth, and Goſpel-Ordinances came by Jeſus Chriſt*: to this your great anſwer, as to moſt of all the reſt, is, *to cry out ignorance, ſee the ignorance of the great Text-man, &c. that Circumciſion came by Abraham, and not by Moſes.* I might retort back again, See the ignorance of this learned Diſputant, that doth not yet know that Circumciſion was reckoned upon *Moſes* account, though given to *Abraham*; & is not reckoned in the new Teſtament ſo much upon *Abrahams* account, as upon *Moſes*, *Lev.* 12. 3. *John* 7. 22. The reaſon is, becauſe that Circumciſion was that in which the children of *Iſrael* were engaged to obedience, and the whole Law was included in it, when firſt given, or elſe by it they could not be bound over to the whole Law; ſo that the uniting of Law and Circumciſion together ſo inſeparably, being indeed both typicall, muſt ſtand and fall together; *Moſes* being

the

the ſervant in that houſe, all the Ordinances being typicall, and the ſervant too. Circumciſion is reckoned with the reſt of the Law, and altogether upon *Moſes* account; therefore, next quarrel with Chriſt, and lay the blame (if there be ſo much) where it is. As to the ſubſtance of the conſequences mentioned, I have anſwered already, they are commonly made uſe of by you. Your three Arguments I ſhall paſs by, mentioned *pag.* 36. referring the Reader to my Anſwer to *The Font-Guarded*, in the beginning of this book. Only the grand Argument taken out of Maſter *Baxters* book, I ſhall untwiſt before I paſs, I doubt not, though I have anſwered it likewiſe in the preceding Treatiſe: The Argument is this.

Thoſe that are Church-members are to be baptized.

Some Infants are Church-members.

Therefore ſome Infants are to be baptized.

You ſay, you preſume none will deny your *Major*; yet give me leave to queſtion it a little. There is no ſuch Scripture that I know of; for there are none that are Church-members upon the viſible account, but thoſe that are baptized, *Act.* 2. 41. They were baptized and added to the Church, not becauſe members, but to make them viſible members, &c.

As for your *Minor*, you ſay you will prove it by Mr. *Baxters* Argument, thus, *If by the merciful gift and appointment of God, not yet repealed, ſome Infants were once to be admitted members into the viſible Church, then ſome Infants are to be admitted ſo ſtill.*

But by the merciful gift and appointment of God, not yet repealed, ſome Infants were admitted members into the viſible Church.

Therefore they are ſo to be admitted ſtill.

Anſw. 1. Your Argument both for *Major* and *Minor* ſerves not at all for the end for which you produce it, *viz.* the confirmation of the *Minor* of your former Argument; for it contradicts it ſelf.

If *Collier* had ſo contradicted one Argument with another, you would have branded him for an *Ignoramus*. In the former Argument you ſay, *Some Infants are Church-members, therefore ought to be baptized.* In this you ſay, as in confirmation of the former, *Some Infants were once to be admitted members*, ſo that it ſuppoſeth a time when they were not members; and you ſeem to contradict your ſelf, and to confirm what I have ſaid, *viz. That Church-members are not admitted to Baptiſm, but they are admitted to membership by Baptiſm, or becauſe baptized:* but your ſelf-contradiction I paſs, only minde it by the way.

And 2. I come to your invincible Argument, *viz.* upon your own account: and the ſtrength of your Argument I perceive lies in this, *Not yet repealed.* Let all the reſt paſs for truth, yet let this be denied, and it comes all to nothing. You ſay *p.* 38. *God never repealed this grant to Infants, &c.* I ſhall (as I have done in the former Treatiſe) prove the Repeal, and then your Argument is fallen. I prove it thus:

If the Covenant made with *Abraham*, in which Infants had thoſe priviledges you ſpeak of, and Church membership, &c. be repealed, then the priviledges of the Covenant are repealed.

But the Covenant it ſelf is repealed. Therefore the priviledges of that Covenant are repealed.

The *Major* is cleer: The *Minor I* prove.

That Covenant whoſe promiſes and priviledges were typical, when the ſubſtance was come, was repealed.

But the Covenant made with *Abraham*, and all its promiſes and priviledges were typical.

Ergo, When the ſubſtance was come, it was all repealed.

That the Covenant was typical, *I* ſhall prove; and it typed out Chriſt and the ſpiritual ſeed.

1. The Covenant typed out Chriſt: for the Covenant on Gods part was, That he would give unto them the *Land of Canaan for an everlaſting poſſeſſion.* This Land of *Canaan* was typical, of which Chriſt was the ſubſtance, *Heb.* 4. from *v.* 7. to 11. Therefore when Chriſt the ſubſtance was come, the type was repealed; and our Covenant now is not of the outward Land of *Canaan*, but of the true Spiritual Land of reſt. And if the Covenant it ſelf be repealed, as none who have their eyes in their heads but may ſee it, then the Church-membership of that Covenant is repealed; and the Church-membership of the Goſpel is a Church-membership of *another Covenant, a better Covenant, eſtabliſhed upon better promiſes*, Heb. 8 therefore another Church-membership. Such as are capable of that Covenant and promiſe, to wit the Spiritual ſeed, are members of the Spiritual promiſe.

And leſt any ſhould think there was a difference between the Covenant made with *Abraham*, and that made with *Moſes*, *I* cannot paſs it thus: for it was all one. When *Moſes* was raiſed up, it was gathered into one Covenant, and related all to one thing. Circumciſion is given by *Moſes*; the promiſe made to *Abraham* was the ſame as made to *Moſes*, to wit, the Land of *Canaan*: therefore the Covenant

nant mentioned *Heb* 8. is ſaid to be *eſtabliſhed upon better promiſes*, becauſe it was a better Covenant; that is, better promiſes then the *Land of Canaan*, viz. the *Heavenly Land*.

If any man dare to ſay, that it is the ſame Covenant as that with *Abraham*; let him take heed, fear and tremble to give God the lye: God one day will appear to be a *God of truth*, and all ſelf-ſeeking and gainſaying men will be found lyars. If any deſire to ſee further into this truth, let them have recourſe unto my former Treatiſe (*Font-Gnard Routed*) in anſwer unto the ſame Argument.

And as to your Arguments to prove the Negative, *That this mercifull grant is not revoked; if it be, it muſt be in mercy or judgment, &c.* I trace you not in it; I ſuppoſe to any reaſonable man it will be needleſs: For if it be cleer as the Sun, that it is repealed; whether in mercy or judgment, to us is not material. Yet this I ſhall ſay, that it is in mercy, and much wiſdom; *For all the Works of God are wrought in mercy and truth.* It was the will and wiſdom of God, that the *Natural ſeed ſhould have an intereſt in the outward Covenant*, and that the *Spiritual ſeed ſhould have a true intereſt in the ſpiritual Covenant and priviledges.* Therefore ceaſe reaſoning thus: *let God be true*; let God have his will, though he take away all cauſe of fleſhly boaſting from us: For now we have no intereſt in any thing in this Covenant, unleſs Chriſt be ours; and if Chriſt be ours, then *all is ours*; but loſe him, and loſe all, 1 *Cor.* 3, 21, 22.

You come (you ſay) to his fourth Error.

That God now reveals his Will not only by the written word, but by dreams and viſions, more credited then the Scriptures.

This you aſſert; it's none of mine; as the Reader may ſee, if he pleaſe to peruſe the place. It is your own invention, and a lying one too. And to this you adde another as great immediately following, *viz.* That you believe the Priſon at *London* had done me good, where you heard I lately was for my Hereſies.

Strange man! you are ſpeaking againſt Dreams, and yet are in the very *interim* dreaming: you did but dream that I was in priſon, and I ſuppoſe it was becauſe you would have it ſo; you had ſtudied deep upon the point the day before, and ſo it ſeems you dream'd the thing was done. What, *Richard Sanders* dream a lye? if he can dream no better then that, he were as good give off dreaming, or at leaſt forbear to publiſh it in writing, leſt all men count him but as he is. And

what:

what I say of Dreaming, is no more but this; that I dare not condemn the thing, because God hath not limited himself; he may reveal himself which way he pleaseth, though not contrary, but agreeable to the Scripture. And further, that it is not my experience, nor any of that *I* know; therefore may be a whimsie of *Tho Halls* own head.

This is the substance of what *I* say; yet you dare to assert, that *I* affirm that God reveals his will that way, & that its more to be credited then the written word; when all *I* say, is, that for all that *I* know, some may have something revealed that way, although *I* know it not. See Mr. *Fox* in the Book of Martyrs, *vol.* 3. *pag.* 607. he relates of that good Martyr Mr. *Philpot*, in a dream or vision he saw as it were a glorious City full of excellencies, &c. and it brought much joy to his soul; it was cleered to him that it was a representation of the glorious Church of Christ: and dare you say this was false? And may not God do the like, if he please? though it's not usual, yet limit not God.

His fifth Error.

That the Saints need not ask the pardon of sin; that it is form and custome that carries them to this petition, Forgive us our sins, &c.

It seems you resolved to lye when you began, and so you will do it to the purpose: but you are driven to confess the truth immediately, that every one that runs may read you. While any lives in the cleer enjoyment of mercy, it is form and custom that carries them to that petition; but if a soul apprehends want of pardon, let him ask it. And is this so strange unto you? truly *I* do not wonder; *I* believe it is in good earnest as strange as you make it. It seems you know not that *there is a time for all things, and every thing in its season is sweet and comely.* There is a time to ask pardon, and a time to rejoyce in the enjoyment of pardon; there is a time to be merry, & a time to be sorry: *If any be merry*, saith *James*, *let him sing*; *if afflicted, let him pray.* And for that word, *If any soul, or when a soul apprehends the want of pardon, let him ask it*; its no otherwise then what *James* saith, *If any want Wisdom, let him ask of God*, &c. *Jam* 1.5. All you say about this, is either a spurning against the truth, and a manifesting of your ignorance in this truth of God; or secondly a declaration of what is included in my assertion, That as they commit new sins, so being sensible of it, and of the want of pardon, let them ask it.

His

His sixth Error.

That gifted Brethren may exerciſe the Miniſterial or Paſtoral act of Preaching in a conſtituted Church, without any Call to the Office of a Miniſter.

Anſ. 1. I ſuppoſe it's impoſſible for you to ſtate any thing truly as it was laid down by me. But that you pretend, that what I have written *is ſo full of contradictions, that in ſober-ſadneſs you know not what I would have.* Truly in ſober-ſadneſs I am much of the mind, that your mind in writing was rather to make the Truth, and my ſelf its ſervant contemptible to the people, then to anſwer the truth written in my book: for elſe you durſt not change my language into your own ſo oft as you do; and then rail, and pretend you anſwer me; nay, pretend you know not what I would have, when it is ſo cleerly aſſerted from Scripture-grounds, not oniy in the generall, but in particular, *pag.* 95. 96. in ſeven or eight particulars: and I ſhall at preſent mind but one, which is the firſt; That all the brethren in the Church that have the gift, may propheſie. You aſſert it thus; *That they may exerciſe the Miniſterial or Paſtoral act*, &c.

Well, but you pretend you will not anſwer the Arguments; that you will leave to your brother *Hall.* But you pittifully cry out of *ignorance in the Collier:* but I ſuppoſe, and its not my ſuppoſition only, that it is your own pittifull ignorance makes you ſo to cry out againſt me: for the Arguments you paſs; nor do you ſay any thing of ſubſtance unto thoſe things you pretend to be Errors. You ſay, you will lay down ſome Obſervations, *Which may ſerve as a key to ſee the weakneſs, ignorance, and impertinency of the ſame.*

You obſerve, *p.* 66. *That I do pittifully ſay, I Sir, and No Sir.* And is this ſuch a pittiful thing? Let the Reader judge.

As to your 7 particulars inſtanced, there is no contradiction in them. For firſt, that gifted brethren may preach according to their gift both in and out of a conſtituted Church, is cleer; and there is not any thing you have ſaid that bears the leaſt ſhew of a ſolid anſwer unto it. For both of theſe, ſee 1 *Cor.* 14. 31. *Rom.* 12. 3. 6. 1 *Pet.* 4. 10, 11. *Act.* 8. 4. with *chap.* 11. 19, 20, 21. & *Act.* 9. 20. & *chap.* 18. 25, 26. in all which it appears, the lawfulneſs of the Preaching of gifted Brethren, both in and out of the Church; and truly I cannot think that you are ſo ignorant of this Truth as you pretend; only you are willing to make a Trade of Preaching; that ſo you may uphold your ho-

nour and profit; and that distinction between Gift and Office is as clear as the Sun; and you say nothing in answer unto it from the Scripture, but in way of comparison with the Magistrate, which will not hold: for men have preached, and it was their duty, without the Office, only by Gift, as in the former Scriptures; but men may not be Magistrates, unless called to office; and the disproportion between things Spiritual and things natural, is that in which natural men are lost, and the wisdom of man cannot reach it.

But you seem with *Tho. Hall*, to make much ado about private Preaching; and to confirm it you produce two Arguments. 1. *If we finde in Scripture that all Christians may preach, taking preaching in a large sence for private duties we owe one to another, &c.* But you prove by Scripture that all Christians may Preach, take Preaching in a large sence, &c. How now *Richard Sanders*; why you are proving more then ever I asserted: Where will you be anon? they may Preach, and they may not; for that which I asserted, was, that gifted brethren might Preach; you say all.

Query 1. *Whether these Scriptures produced by you, do at all speak of Preaching?* 1 Thes. 4.18. *comfort one another with these words*, Heb. 3.13. *But exhort one another daily, while it is called to day.*

Qu. 2. *If it do infer Preaching, why not publick in the Church? If they were to exhort one another, why not in the Church? What word is there that hinders that it was not in the Church, and so publick?*

So likewise in the rest of the Scriptures; so that by all that is said, here is no room for private Preaching, unless particular exhortation; so men in office may preach as well as men out of office; So that because there is a private watching in the Church of Christ, and a private admonition, exhortation, &c. you will therefore call it private Preaching; and if you make that Preaching, then you think to limit all the gifts in the Church there, so contradicting all the Scriptures before mentioned: and its true all are not teachers in way of Office: yet all that have gifts, may, nay ought to make use of them for the good of the body and the glory of Christ.

The second Argument is taken from women. *If it be lawfull for women to preach privately, &c. But women may preach privately, &c.*

Answ. Here you lie pittifully in the dust; let the Reader peruse the Scripture produced by you for proof of your assertion, that women may Preach, 2 *Tim.* 1.5. and 2 *Tim.* 3.15. See if there be ever a word

of

of Preaching in that place, or any thing that hath a tendency to it. Surely you think people are so ignorant that the very mentioning of Scripture will satisfie them, although it be nothing to the purpose; the other Scripture *Act.*18.26. The text saith, it was *Aquila* and *Priscilla* his wife. The word is, *expounded the way of the Lord, &c.* But how will you prove that it was *Priscilla* that expounded? Why not *Aquila*, if it must be preaching, as well as *Priscilla*?

But what should I rake after such nonsence and confusion? I do not in the least question the womens Duty in their station, as well as all the brethrens, which is to watch, to reprove, to restore, to exhort, &c. yet this prevents not the brethrens Duty, who have received Gifts from the Lord to make use of them publickly for the good of the whole: and they justly forfeit them if they neglect, and they may be taken from them, and given to those who will better improve them; and I am confident that the gifts of Christ in the Saints, will confound and bring to nothing the Worldly Ministry, and that so much the rather too, because they so much envy and oppose the Truth, and way of God in this particular.

You observe 3ly. *That I take no notice of the thing in hand, When the question is stated, Whether any may Preach in a constituted Church, not called to Office? the Scriptures my answers are grounded upon, speak only of Preaching to Infidels, &c.*

Ans. If you were not wilfull or blinde, you might see, that I prove Preaching both in, and out of a constituted Church too; the Scriptures I produced for Preaching in a constituted Church, are *Rom.*12. 3.6. 1 *Cor.*14.31. and that it intends the Brethren without exception, see *ver.*1. where he speaks to the Church, *Desire spiritual gifts, but rather that ye may propheſie*, and none are excepted but women, *ver.*34. 1 *Pet.*1.10,11. and as for that you make so much ado about, the *extraordinarines of the case of the Preaching of the scattered brethren to Infidels*: I have answered it in the former Treatise; yet something shall I say here; 1. An unlawfull thing is not made lawful by the extraordinarines of the case, unless in case of saving life; so the Lord *will have mercy and not sacrifice*, as in the Scripture mentioned by you; provided it be not in the profession of Christ; then *he that to save his life will deny Christ before men, he will deny him before his Father which is in heaven*; so that necessity makes not an unlawfull thing lawfull: If *Uzzah* touch the Ark, he must die, 2 *Sam.*

 6. 6,7

6.6,7. Bre. 2. What neceſſity was there in it, that *Paul*, or the ſcattered Brethren or *Apollo* ſhould preach? if it were unlawfull, there was no neceſſity, unleſs ſuch as *Paul* minds, *A neceſſity is upon me, and wo is me if I preach not the Goſpel*, 1 Cor.9.16. And if this neceſſity was upon them I think it was lawfull, and upon the ſame account is it lawfull for any of the Saints that have received the Gift to Preach; therefore for ſhame forbear to tell of the extraordinarineſs of the Caſe any more, if the thing in it ſelf was lawfull: and do not abuſe the Scripture for the upholding of your own ends and intereſts, and do no more charge folly upon the Servants of the Lord for their fulfilling of the will of Chriſt. And whereas you pretend, *That one Scripture witneſſing that God hath appointed and fixed ſome in office for the work of the Miniſtry, is of more ſtrength to condemn the liberty of preaching pleaded for, then twenty Examples of gifted mens preaching.* Let the Reader judge of the truth of this, or whether both theſe held forth in Scripture do not clearly ſpeak thus much to it, that both are to have being together, not one to put out the other; and that Office that thinks to ſilence Gift, is no Office of *Jeſus Chriſt*, but that which ſeeks it ſelf, and its reward will be accordingly.

But I might conclude more ſure then you, that there being a fixed Scripture that Commands Baptizing of Believers, is of ſtrength enough to condemn a thouſand conſequences for ſprinkling of Infants, having not ſo much as any preſident for it: you would feign preſidents for ſprinkling of Infants if you could; but you endeavour to overturn Preſidents of preaching Brethren that they ſhould not be uſefull to us; let the people judge of what Spirit you are of: And the reaſon I judge is this, your own ſtanding depends ſo poſitively upon it, that unleſs you can uphold the one and ſuppreſs the other, you are like to fall together.

Obſerv.4. *That in my pleading for a general liberty of Preaching in a conſtituted Church, I do not inform how far I extend it, Whether it be with the conſent of the Paſtor and people, or whether he may Preach whether they will or no?*

Anſw. I leave the truth of this likewiſe to the Reader to judge; whether it be not often aſſerted in my Book, pag 29. *The Churches freedom or deſire is Call enough, if the party be gifted to it; all lawfull Calls to Preach either within or without are ſutable to the Gift*, pag.30. *The Church hath power to Call forth a gifted Brother to do ſervice*

ſervice for the Church; and in the *Poſtſcript*, at the end, it is thus written; *In what I have written, I intend that only Brethren that have Gifts may exerciſe them in an orderly way*, that is, with the deſire or conſent of the Church, as any man might eaſily underſtand; ſo there is no truth in your obſervation.

Obſer. 5. *That in moſt of his Anſwers he doth not reply to the Scripture reaſon alledged againſt him, but declining that, as a little too hard for him.*

That I leave to the Reader to judge, whether I have declined a poſitive Anſwer to all, both the Arguments and Scriptures; and who hath declined the Argument and Scriptures moſt; I in my Anſwers to *Tho. Hall*, or *Rich. Sanders* in his anſwer to mine.

So you come, *you ſay, to open ſeveral Scriptures, from giving any countenance to that* Babel; *and the two firſt that you will ſpeak to is* Act. 8.4. and *Act* 9.20. *but in this you will obſerve two Rules.*

1. *That in weighty things of God, a Chriſtian muſt have a certain Rule, or warrant for his practiſe, &c.* I like it well; and if you held firm to this truth, you muſt deny all your own practiſe.

2. *That Arguments drawn from examples in Scripture are of credit, according to the credit of the perſons whoſe examples they are, &c.*

This I own for truth likewiſe: But you ſay, *Thoſe examples are of men not infallible &c.*

How prove you that? dare you queſtion it? and doth not the Scripture ſay, the hand of the Lord was with them? yet dare you queſtion the ſpirit by which they were guided? *Acts* 11.21. All the reſt you ſay to this is nothing at all; therefore I ſay no more but refer the Reader to what is at large anſwered in the *Pulpit-Guard Routed:* as for the ſecond Scripture, *Act.* 9.20. you confeſs, *That he Preached before he was ſolemnly ſet apart to be an Apoſtle to the Gentiles.* 2. *You ſay he was ſent by an immediate voice to* Ananias, *that he ſhould tell him what he ſhould do*; but *Ananias* did not bid him preach, *but ariſe and be baptized*, &c. You minde *what you have from* Sauls *own mouth*, ch. 22.14. *Ananias* ſaith to him, *Thou ſhalt be a witneſs to all men of what thou haſt ſeen and heard*, ver. 15. This was no ſetting of him apart to the Office; he told him *that he ſhould be a witneſs, &c.* but did not Ordain him unto it: and upon your account *Saul* ſhould have been ſilent till he had been ordained; but he was not as before, and *Act.* 26.16,17,18. *Gods immediate ſending him*, was nor the outward Office, as you pretend.

You ſay, *the other Scripture he often urges*; and why not, having often occaſion? 1 *Pet.*4.10,11. *Rom.* 12.6.7. Theſe, you ſay, are *far fetcht conſequences.*

Anſw. They are no conſequences man, but plain Scripture Precepts; *Chriſtians muſt adminiſter their gifts, therefore they muſt be publick Preachers, &c.* Why not publick? do the Scriptures make a difference? And what you ſay further to theſe Scriptures, hath been anſwered already; therefore I ſay no more.

The next Scripture is *Pſal.*145. 10,11. All you ſay to this is very learnedly; *As though this hath any relation to publick preaching*, when he ſaith, *they ſhall make known to the ſons of men his mighty Acts and the glorious Majeſty of his Kingdom*; but this you have left out; you durſt not put it in your Book, leſt the Reader ſhould ſee your folly. The next Scripture is 1 *Cor.* 14. 31. This you pretend to prove was extraordinary Propheſie, and not ordinary, as the Pulpit-Guard Routed ſayes.

And you ſay, *That your great work ſhall be to prove that prophecy* 1 Cor.14.31. *was extraordinary, and not ordinary*, as the *Pulpit-Guard Routed* ſayes.

1. You ſay, *You read*, p.60. *that the reaſon why propheſie was extraordinary in the Law, and this ordinary* 1 Cor. 14.3. *is becauſe its a ſpeaking to edification, exhortation and comfort, &c.* The ſubſtance of what you ſeem to anſwer to this is, 1. Becauſe *ſuch as were prophets did ſpeak to edification; therefore thoſe who ſpeak to edification are prophets. In this you ſay is ſome Sophiſtry, &c.*

But give me leave to ſhew your Sophiſtry; and that firſt in pretending an Anſwer, when tis nothing to the purpoſe; the end of my uſing theſe words, was to preſent the Reader with the difference between the Propheſie of the Old Teſtament, which was to foretell things to come, and this of the New; this 1 *Cor.*14. is an ordinary way of propheſie for the building up of the Church, that ſo all *may be inſtructed, and all may be comforted.*

2. I anſwer, that thoſe Saints that can ſpeak to edification, &c. are prophets; nay all the Lords People are prophets; therefore your Sophiſtry, nor yet your Logick will not hold; for though *the ground may be wet without rain*; yet it is not often wet without water: and if a Saint, a Member of the Church can ſpeak to edification, exhortation and conſolation, he is a Prophet: if he have the Teſtimony of *Jeſus*, he hath the Spirit of Propheſie.

2. You

2. You ſay, *The Prophets under the Law ſpake to edification.*

I anſwer. There is none queſtions that, but that their propheſying had that end in it : and its ſo to us at this day, when we come to underſtand them ; but the propheſying mentioned 1 *Cor.* 14. was a common and ordinary propheſying in the Church, for the edification of the Body : That in the Law was a foretelling of things to come, and therefore written, to be kept on Record to poſterity; this not written, becauſe ordinary, and as *Thomas Hall* confeſſeth, it was ſuch a propheſie, as in it they *might err, &c.* So that I ſay again, they under the Law took not their denomination from this kind of propheſying, *viz.* an ordinary ſpeaking to build up ſouls in the preſent knowledge of God; but from their receiving their propheſie immediatly from God, diſcovering things to come.

Whereas you ſay, *They were not called Prophets in the old Teſtament from the matter of their propheſie, but for the manner of receiving it.*

1. I anſwer, it was from both matter and manner too.

2. If what you ſay be truth, ſee a clear difference; thoſe 1 *Cor.* 14. are called Prophets, not ſo much from the manner, as the matter : *He that propheſieth, ſpeaketh to edification, exhortation, and conſolation :* as if he ſhould ſay, if you would know a Prophet, it is ſuch a one as ſpeaks *to edification, &c.* and whoſoever ſpeaks not *to edification, &c.* is no *Prophet*; for the Apoſtle doth not only direct them in the manner of propheſie, but in the matter too; its a word to edification; and truly you either miſerably contradict your ſelves, or elſe do of purpoſe to keep ſouls in the dark; for *Thomas Hall*, whom you pretend to vindicate, applyeth that Scripture 1 Cor. 14. 32. *The ſpirits of the Prophets are ſubject to the Prophets: viz. to the probation and examination of the Presbyterie*; and he hath no other Scripture to prove the *Preſbyterian examination and probation*, but that; yet afterwards both with him and you, that propheſie is extraordinary; and yet you confeſs that *Presbyterie* was an ordinary office; what contradictions are theſe, and what will you not ſay for your own ends?

You ſeem much to harp upon one thing, and that of little conſequence to the thing in hand : *That the extraordinary way of Revelation did denominate their ſayings to be propheſies, and not their foretelling things to come.*

I ſay, that not only that, but the matter of the propheſie, as well as the manner; as a blind man might ſee or underſtand : for if any propheſie, and the matter of the propheſie proved not true, he was no

true

true Prophet: therefore, that the people might know a true Prophet under the Law, they were to look at the matter of the propheſie, not the manner of receiving it. Iſa. 23. 26. *How long ſhall this be in the heart of the Prophets, to propheſie lies?* ver. 28. *The Prophet that hath a dream, let him tell a dream; and he that hath my word, let him ſpeak my word faithfully, &c.* So that it was the faithful and true ſpeaking of the word, from whence they had the denomination of Prophet; and this in ſubſtance you confeſs, *page* 101. contradicting what you ſay, *p.* 100. *It was the extraordinary way of Revelation; here its the manifeſtation of their propheſie, becauſe they manifeſted to others (by divine inſpiration) things paſt, preſent, and to come.* So that now you confeſs its the manifeſtation, by revelation of truth, that made them Prophets, not the ordinary way of ſpeaking to edification, &c. mentioned 1 *Cor.* 14. 3.

As to all you ſay to *Rev.* 19 10. *page* 103. I may truly retort your own words, *I am afraid the devil hath taught you to play the Sophiſter*; for when the Text ſaith, *The teſtimony of Jeſus is the ſpirit of propheſie*, you ſay immediatly, *and extraordinarily inſpired*: Doth the Text ſay ſo, or is it your own invention? I leave to the Reader to judge: And as for your diſtinction from *Chap.* 1. *ver.* 2. *The Word of God, and the Teſtimony of Jeſus*, its one and the ſame in ſubſtance; or at moſt, the Teſtimony of Jeſus is but an explanation of the word of God: He was baniſhed *for the Word of God, even for the Teſtimony of Jeſus*, ſo the Greek word ἐ muſt of neceſſity ſometimes be underſtood: As *Col.* 2. 2. the Apoſtle manifeſting his earneſt deſire for the Saints, that they might come to the *Knowledge of God, and of the Father, &c.* which muſt be rendred, *even of the Father*; a word rather to explain the former, then diſtinguiſh, &c. So that *John* doth not ſo diſtinguiſh, as if he had been more *excellent then the reſt of the Apoſtles in the teſtimony of Jeſus, &c.* but for that it was he was baniſhed: and the truth is, that the Teſtimony of Jeſus, though not ſo eminent as the Apoſtles, yet if by the ſame ſpirit, according to the rule of truth, and according to the meaſure received, it is *the ſpirit of propheſie.*

As for what you ſay to that Scripture 1 *Cor.* 14. 37. *Every ſpiritual man is a Prophet.*

All the Saints are ſpiritual.

Therefore all Prophets.

What you with ſo much contempt ſay to this, doth but diſcover of what ſpirit you are; and you might know, that when I ſay *the Saints are not all Prophets*, page 21. I intended that they had not all the ſame

gift

gift of propheſie, *to ſpeak to the edifying of the Church*, and upon that account they are not all Prophets.

Yet ſecondly, they are all Prophets upon a common account, and are able to ſpeak ſomething of God and Chriſt, as occaſion is offered, this God promiſed. and hath made good. that he would *pour out of his Spirit upon all fleſh, &c.* So that the truth holds clear, That every ſpiritual man is a Prophet, and that according to the meaſure of the gift, ſo he may, and ought to ſpeak: though all are not Prophets, *viz.* able to ſpeak in the Church to edification, exhortation, and conſolation; yet all are Prophets, and may ſpeak occaſionally to edification, though not in the Church.

Some of the grounds you pretend to anſwer, *As that theſe Prophets were ſuch as needed direction from the Apoſtles, &c.* therefore not extraordinary.

You pretend to anſwer this, firſt, *Becauſe there were extraordinary tongues, and the Apoſtle directs them: and why not direct extraordinary Prophets too?*

Anſw. 1. If by ordinary and extraordinary, you mean the one common to all; the other more then ordinary, ſo not common to all; that I alwayes have granted, and ſhall, as in the caſe of propheſying. So of tongues, All have the Spirit of Chriſt; that is ordinary to all: *If any man have not the Spirit of Chriſt, he is none of his*, Rom. 8. 9. yet all have not the gift of propheſie, to ſpeak in the Church, as before. So in thoſe tongues there was that ſpeech of the things of God that was ordinary to all, and that of tongues which was proper to but ſome, as Propheſie: yet not ſo extraordinary, as to be either 1. infallible, therefore needed direction: or 2. paſſing; for the Apoſtle *ſpake with tongues more then they all.*

And ſecondly, that this of tongues was not ſuch an extraordinary buſineſs as you pretend, is clear; and that firſt from the Apoſtles diſſwading them from it, as you may ſee at large in the Chapter, and that from the unprofitableneſs of it, both to the Church, and to the world too. *ver.* 2, 3. and 23, 24.

2. He ſaith, ver. 5. *Greater is he that propheſieth, then he that ſpeaketh with tongues*; and the reaſon is rendred, becauſe he that propheſieth, *edifieth the Church, &c.*

You ſay there is yet one reaſon more, *page* 87.

Praying and Propheſying are put together 1 Cor. 11. 5. *Was it extraordinary praying too?*

You answer, *You will put in that too for his Learning.* 1 Cor. 14. 14, 15. *If I pray in an unknown Tongue, &c.* Is not here extraordinary praying?

Doth the Scripture call it extraordinary anywhere: and may we not say truly, as the Apostle saith of Prophesie, *greater is he that prophecieth, then he that speaketh with tongues*? and the reason is, because *he speaketh to edification*: so say I, greater was, and is he that prayeth in a known tongue, then he that prayeth in an unknown tongue; and the Apostle upon the same account disswades them as well from praying or praising in an unknown tongue, as from speaking in an unknown tongue; and if that prayer had been extraordinary, surely he would not have perswaded them from it; for I think, that prayer is most extraordinary that is most prevailing with God, and that is the prayer of Faith; not of an unknown tongue.

You now come to give your Reasons, why this Prophesie is extraordinary: 1. Because it is joyned with extraordinary gifts, 1 *Cor.* 14. *viz. The gift of Tongues.*

Ans. 1. Those gifts as hath been already shewed, were not so extraordinary as you pretend. For *greater was he that prophesied then he that spake with tongues.*

But 2. Were what you say truth, that *that Propheſy in this Chapter were intermixed with extraordinary gifts as that of tongues*; for which you say *its unlikely that Propheſy should be ordinary*; I say, were what you say in the first place truth; yet the second doth not follow. For in Scripture its ordinary to place or intermix those gifts or offices which you call ordinary and extraordinary together; And I wonder you had not so much in you as to see it; That might have saved you the labour of setting down this Reason. See 1 *Cor* 12 29 *Are all Apostles? are all Prophets? are all Teachers? are all Workers of Miracles? &c*

You affirm *Apostles, Prophets, Miracles are extraordinary*: and *Teachers* placed in the midst to be ordinary, or by way of ordinary office. So *Rom*, 12. *v.* 6, 7, 8. *v.* 6. he speaks of Propheſy. You say that it is extraordinary; yet its joyned in with that you call ordinary *Teaching and exhortation. v.* 7, 8. you parallel with it for your proof *Ephes.* 4. 11. which Scripture makes as much against you as any I know when rightly understood. For 1. these are not extraordinary offices, as is discoursed at large in the *Pulpit-Guard Routed*; But the ordinary standing gifts and offices in the Church of Christ. And Secondly, if otherwise

wiſe upon your own account, Apoſtles, Prophets, Evangeliſts which you ſay are extraordinary, are reckoned up with Paſtors and Teachers which you ſay are ordinary and continuing offices in the Church of Chriſt.

And 3. I wonder how you dare to divide, and with *Tho. Hall* to pick out what you pleaſe; and to call one ordinary, and another extraordinary: when the Scripture preſents them all as ſtanding in the Church upon the ſame account, gifts given forth by the Spirit from Chriſt to the Church. And you would take ſome, and leave others; ſo rob the Church of Chriſt of thoſe gifts, orders, Priviledges and Officers that Chriſt hath given to it; but no wonder; for you own neither Church, Ordinances, Gifts or Officers according to the mind of Chriſt, but what you have received by Tradition, from Antichriſt.

You ſay that he ſayth, *Apoſtles are not extraordinary; and as for Evangeliſts he hath nothing to ſay of them &c.*

Truly, had you not been blind or forgetfull, there is enough ſaid of them. It ſeems I muſt ſay it again.

Pag. 70. *An Evangeliſt is not an extraordinary, but an ordinary work; a cryer or publiſher of glad tydings*; which is proper to all the ſervants of the Lord, that preach glad tydings to men; and as for Apoſtles, they are not extraordinary, but ordinary; I ſay it again, and I wonder you durſt to oppoſe ſo clear a truth; thoſe who are ſent of God to preach the Goſpel for converting ſouls, and gathering Churches, are Apoſtles, *viz.* ſent ones; and the Twelve Apoſtles did not take their denomination from their extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, but from their miſſion from Chriſt to do his work; ſo that notwithſtanding none are ſo ſent as thoſe Apoſtles were; 1. immediately or by an immediate miſſion from his own mouth. 2. So immediately inſpired and abilitated from above; nor 3. to do the ſame work in every particular, though the ſame in ſubſtance; *viz.* to be the firſt Planters of the Goſpel, to eſtabliſh it by ſigns and miracles, &c. Yet there is the ſame in truth; and men ſent for the gathering of Churches are as truly Apoſtles as they were: as the ſons of God are as truly the ſons of God as Chriſt himſelf, though not filled with the ſame fullneſs. And that you may ſee there were more Apoſtles then thoſe, Chriſt was the great Apoſtle, *Heb.* 3.1. and he ſent the Twelve; and other Apoſtles its more then probable there were. *Rom.* 16.7. the Scripture ſaith that *Andronicus and Junias were of note among the Apoſtles.*

1. Its probable that they were Apoſtles &c. elſe how ſhould they be of note or reckoned among them?

2. That there were Apoſtles there; and it could not be of the Twelve. For *Paul* was the only Apoſtle to the Gentiles, and the others of the Circumciſion; they were of note among the Apoſtles of or belonging to the Church in *Rome*. But Secondly, Its apparent that there are or ſhall be both Apoſtles and Prophets at the Fall of *Babylon*: which work I believe is now begun: and the Lord hath his *ſent ones* abroad in the World, in and by whom he will effect his work; who ſhall rejoyce in the fall of *Babylon*, Rev. 18. 20. *Rejoyce over her ye holy Apoſtles and Prophets, for God hath avenged you on her.* So that notwithſtanding all your ſcuffling ſhifts you make to help your ſelf, and to keep up your honour with the people; yet know that God is truth, and every man that oppoſeth him ſhall be found a lyar; and that he hath left theſe ordinary ſtanding gifts and offices in his Church, *Apoſtles, Prophets, Evangeliſts, Paſtors, Teachers, &c.* And whereas you ſay that I argue againſt it, p. 70. that thoſe *ſcattered brethren*, Act. 8. *were not Apoſtles, though ſent to gather Saints, &c.* That I ſay is (as a blind man may underſtand) that they were none of the twelve Apoſtles; for they tarried at *Jeruſalem*: in anſwer to *Tho. Halls* aſſertion, that they might be Apoſtles; whereas it is ſaid that the Apoſtles *tarried at Jeruſalem*: but that they were Apoſtles, *viz.* ſent forth by the Lord, not in a common way, though not of the twelve Apoſtles.

The ſecond Reaſon, *Becauſe this Word* Prophet *hath been alwayes uſed to ſignifie a perſon extraordinarily inſpired of God, when taken in a good ſenſe, &c.*

Anſ. 1. Becauſe Prophets were ordinarily taken in this ſenſe in the Old Teſtament, and ſometimes ſo taken in the New Teſtament; therefore to conclude they were alwayes ſo taken, is a *Non ſequitur*, and there is no ground for it; no more then becauſe in the Old Teſtament all were circumciſed, in the New Teſtament ſome were circumciſed, therefore all muſt be circumciſed.

2. Uſually theſe extraordinary Prophets, as you call them, had their Propheſies written, and they were kept upon record for after-times: but amongſt ſo many Prophets in every Church, none of their Propheſies are recorded, therefore no extraordinary Prophets. And further, that they were not extraordinary, is cleer, in that their Doctrine was to be tryed by the Church, or at leaſt by the reſt of the Prophets;

and

and this you never find done by any of the extraordinary Prophets. And laſtly, if they had been extraordinary, they could rather have directed the Apoſtle, then the Apoſtle ſhould have directed them, as *Act.* 21. 11. Which arguments were urged in the *Pulpit-Guard Rented*; but you were ſo wiſe, it ſeems, as to take no notice of them.

I might add to all the reſt, that the extraordinary Propheſie was ſuch an immediate revelation and inſpiration, as that when it came, they could not but propheſie. This was ſuch a propheſie, as they had firſt need to be exhorted to it, and ſecondly are bid to deſire it, and thirdly had need to be informed of their liberty, and fourthly to be directed unto the right manner of the performing of it, 1 *Cor.* 14 1,2. & 31. & 29.30. therefore no extraordinary, but ordinary Prophets. Theſe things thus conſidered, I queſtion not but that it ſufficiently makes null your ſecond Reaſon.

Your third Argument is, *That the gift or ſpirit of Propheſie given out to the New Teſtament Prophets, is the fulfilling of the promiſe*, Joel 2 28. *therefore extraordinary.*

Anſ. Granted that it is the ſame ſpirit, and fulfilling of the ſame promiſe, yet not the ſame extraordinary gift. If no Prophets but thoſe who have extraordinary gifts, then no Paſtors and Teachers; for then they had extraordinary gifts; and upon the ſame account thoſe who have not the like gifts are not Paſtors and Teachers; upon the ſame account no believers. *Mar.* 16.17. *Theſe ſigns ſhall follow them that believe*, &c. So that upon this account you will reaſon out all Religion and Chriſtianity out of the world.

Therefore ſecondly, they having the Spirit, or the gifts and operations of the Spirit, might in their Propheſies be above us: yet according to the meaſure received, we may, nay ought, *viz.* the Prophets, to ſpeak in the Church, &c. Or elſe that propheſie *Joel* 2. 28. hath nothing to do with us, nor we with it, we are not under that promiſe; ſo all the promiſes are not in Chriſt *yea and amen* to us. And how dare you to make null the great Goſpel propheſie and promiſe, nay the great and bleſſed promiſe of Chriſt at his departure from his Diſciples *Joh.* 14. 16. *viz.* of the Spirit?

Your fourth Argument is, *Becauſe Propheſie is ſet down diſtinct from ordinary Teaching*, Rom. 12. 6.

A little to diſcover the ſtrength of this Argument, I reaſon thus: Exhortation in the ſame place is ſet down diſtinct from Teaching, therefore it is extraordinary Exhortation. Therefore I have in the

Pulpit Guard Routed, cleerly distinguished between Gift and Office; and if the Lord enlighten us in these, that we could but distinguish, we should not thus confound one thing with another, and turn out some truths to retain others; but every truth would stand in its place, and so there would be a sweet harmony, as in Scripture, so in the Church of Christ.

Your fifth Argument is, *Because the gift of Prophesie was given to others besides Saints.*

This is learned Logick indeed: Because wicked men have the use of the things of the world, therefore it is not proper to all the Saints to have the use of the things of the world: because wicked men may have the spirit of Prophesie, therefore it is not proper to the Saints to have it. Let the Reader judge of this Logick. Or else because wicked men may have a form of godliness, denying the power; therefore it is not proper to all the Saints to have the form of godliness. This Argument I leave to the Reader; and follow you to your other additional Arguments.

1. *Because God hath not appointed all gifted brethren to live of the Gospel, therefore they are not to preach the Gospel.* The Scripture you produce is 1 *Cor* 9.14.

Ans. This Scripture is to be understood in way of distinction; and that,

1. That they that preach the Gospel, may, not that they must, live of the Gospel: then *Paul* lived unlawfully, when he wrought with his hands *Act* 18.3. and his hands ministred to his necessities; and *it is a more blessed thing to give then to receive.* So that it is only a discovery of the mind of God, what he that preaches the Gospel may do, if he need it. Hence *Paul* saith, he had a power not to work, but to live of the Gospel; and he had a power to work, and not to live of the Gospel. But it seems you are very loth to heare on that eare.

2. It intends that only those who are called to the office, and set apart wholly to that work, that they should, if they need, live of the Gospel, 1 *Tim.* 5.17,18. You never read that Prophets were to live of the Gospel. So that this distinction keeps the truth cleer, and dissolves your Argument to nothing.

Your second Argument, is. *Because to preach publiquely, is to exercise authority: But none may exercise authority, but such as have Ministerial authority, &c.* The Scripture for confirmation of this, is 1 *Tim* 2.12.

where

where *Women are forbidden to teach publikely, becauſe they may not uſurp authority over the man.*

Anſ. This Argument and Scripture will do you no good to that end for which you have produced it; but cleerly contradicts that you drive at: for the Apoſtle both in 1 *Cor.* 4 34. & 1 *Tim* 2.12. holds forth the difference in generall between men and women in the Church, not between women and men in office; that is non-ſenſe; for he ſaith 1 *Cor* 14 35. *If the woman will know any thing, let her ask her husband at home.* There is no ſuch word ſpoken of the men. So that men have authority to ſpeak in the Church to edification, having the gift; but women have not that authority allowed them, although they have the gift, &c.

Your third Argument. *If there be a power in the Church to keep off Wolves and falſe teachers from the ſheep; then all that conceive they have gifts, may not preach, till they are approved, &c.*

Anſ. It is granted that there is ſuch a power in the Church of Chriſt; and they are able to judge of gifts, when they hear, whether it be of God or of man; and they muſt hear, before they can judge: And when they hear and judge that it is of God; not a wolf, but a ſheep; not a falſe, but a true Prophet, ſpeaking to *edification, exhortation, and conſolation*, they may with comfort hear and approve the ſpeaking of ſuch in the Church.

Your fourth Argument, is; *If to appoint to the office of a Miniſter, and the work of a Miniſter be all one, then no man is appointed to the work of a Miniſter, but he that is appointed to the office. But to appoint to the office of a Miniſter, and the work of a Miniſter, be all one.* Ergo.

Anſ. Your *Minor* is denied. A man may be appointed to the work of a Miniſter, yet never be appointed to the office. For,

1. *Richard Sanders* himſelf in his own practiſe ſhall confute this Logick; for he ſaith, *That he Preached a long time before he was Ordained*, &c. but he mends the matter, *It was in order to the Miniſtry*. But in caſe *Richard Sanders* had died before he had been ordained, then Preaching and the Office of the Miniſtry had not been one, there had been a great deal of Preaching without Office. So that in this your practiſe you contradict your reaſon, and you allowed your ſelf in the thing which you condemn.

2. Were theſe *Act.* 8. 4. appointed to the office? they did the work: but the office you read not of. And thoſe 1 *Pet.* 4. 10, 11. they

they were commanded to the work, but not to the office; for then every one must have been officers, &c.

3. You have given your Argument, but never a Scripture to confirm it; but you endeavour to confirm one Reason by another, without Scripture. Take heed, *Richard*, of outing Scripture with your Reason; be content to fall down under the power of truth; let God be true, and all fleshes wisdom, so far as it opposeth God, be a lye.

You now come to his 7. Error.

That Humane Learning is no way necessary to the Ministry of the Gospel; and that I affirm, p. 38. 39. 41. *Pulpit-Guard Routed, that the power of the Spirit of Christ in Saints, is sufficiently able to make them to divide the word aright, and to convince gain-sayers.*

And dare you deny this Truth? Is not the Spirit of *Christ* sufficient? dare you derogate from the Holy Spirit? and do you find any other Ministery or Teacher then the Spirit in the Scripture? 1 *Cor.* 12. *Joh.* 14. 26. *&* 16. 7, 8. But you seem to help this again; you deny not the ability of the Spirit; but you question *the will, or if he please to do it.* I think that needs not be the Question, but rather whether you are in the Scripture directed to any other way for the attaining of the minde of God then the Spirit and the Scripture; but you question, pag. 126. *Whether the main and principle Doctrine of the Scriptures be so plainly laid down, as that a Christian may attain unto the knowledge of the same without humane Learning*; you grant, that if he *have a Translation he may*: and have not we a Translation in *English*; and is it not true, but false? then the Translators have done wrong: but is it not true in the substance? is there any material, fundamental mistake? if not, then an *English* man in the *English* Translation may understand the minde of God as much and more, if he have a greater measure of the Spirit, then an *Hebritian* and *Grecian* can understand in those Languages. 2. I answer, that I do not quarrell against Tongues, but at the abuse of them, to make an Idol of them: I know you may come to the knowledge of the Letter of Scripture in an ordinary way more fully with it then without it; but it is the abuse of it that I quarrel at, because you set it up in the room of the Spirit, as if none could understand Scripture but those that have Tongues; then the Faith of all others must be an implicite Faith, built upon the credit of men, which would prove very weak in the end.

3. Its

3. Its the uſe of Philoſophy in the things of God, as ſome of you affirm, that there is a neceſſity of *ſtudying Arts, Sciences, Logick, Rhetorick, &c.* to make them Miniſters, as *Tho. Halls Pulpit Guard*; make uſe of your tongues; bring forth the truth of the Original to the people, help thoſe that want it, and make not an Idol of it, &c.

You proceed to produce ſome Scriptures, *A good account of which cannot be given without the help of humane Learning.*

Anſw. In this you ſhew ſo much weakneſs, that I would not ſay a word unto it, were it not for one or two of them, and I ſhall ſay but a word or two.

1. Is there any thing material in any of theſe Scriptures? Put caſe a man knew not the Emphaſis of the Original, as *Rich. Sanders* cals it; Is any thing laid open by him material? or 2. if ſo, its that which may be eaſily attained. But to the Scriptures; the firſt is *Apoſtolos*; and what if a man never knew that it ſignifies *Sent*? why might he not underſtand as much as your ſelf in it? for every man that knows any thing, knows that the twelve Apoſtles, and *Paul*, were Apoſtles; and you know no more; you do not know that all that are ſent of Jeſus Chriſt, are Apoſtles, *viz. Sent.*

The ſecond Scripture, of πέτρος *a Rock*, you ſeem to give a learned interpretation, as if Chriſt intended to build his Church upon *Peter*; ſo much is clearly hinted in what you ſay. I trace you no farther in this; I leave the weight of what you ſay concerning thoſe Scriptures, to the Reader, becauſe I am in haſte. As to that you ſay concerning Ghoſt, I perceive you know well what the word is in the Greek; and what if it were alwayes ſo tranſlated in Engliſh? and I think it is one of the greateſt wrongs to our Engliſh tranſlation, the miſpronouncing of words, in pronouncing Hebrew and Greek inſtead of Engliſh; *Meſſias* from *Meſha*, inſtead of Anointed: Emmanuel inſtead of God with us: In Greek Chriſt from *Chriſtos*, inſtead of anointed; *Jeſus* inſtead of Saviour; *Apoſtle* inſtead of Sent; *Baptize* inſtead of Dip or Waſh, &c. and Ghoſt inſtead of Spirit, though thats no Greek word. Why do you not reform theſe things with your learning, unleſs it be done on purpoſe to keep people in ignorance?

But you have ſomething farther to ſay it ſeems, and that very learnedly, *page* 134. and you have much to ſay to this particular; *That there is not any Scripture underſtood by ſpiritual Chriſtians, the grammatical ſenſe of which, a man that hath not the Spirit of Chriſt may attain unto*; and page 135. *That Scripture is ſufficient to diſcover its own*

ſenſe to all men, diligently improving the outward helps afforded by God; and that if it be the Spirits work to diſcover the ſenſe and meaning of Scripture, then the Spirits work is to make Notioniſts, &c.

Anſw. And is this your ſpiritualneſs indeed? That a natural man without the Spirit may underſtand the mind of God? for if he underſtand the ſenſe and meaning of the Scripture, then he underſtands the mind of God; and this is contrary to the Scripture, *For the natural man doth not underſtand the things that are of God, neither can he underſtand them*, 1 Cor. 2. 14. *But we have the mind of Chriſt.*

2. If this be truth that you affirm, then what is the reaſon that you, with all your humane Learning, do not yet underſtand the ſenſe and meaning of the Scripture? and that firſt in common and ordinary things, as that the Covenant made with *Abraham* and *Moſes*, &c. is not the ſame as the Goſpel-Covenant; when the Scripture ſaith plainly that it is not the ſame, *but another Covenant, not ſuch a Covenant as the firſt was, but eſtabliſhed upon better promiſes*, &c. What is the reaſon that you do not underſtand that Command of Chriſt, that it is Believers that are to be baptized, and not Infants? and that you underſtand not, that when Chriſt ſaith, *That upon this Rock will I build my Church*, he means not *Peter*, but the Rock of *Peters* confeſſion; *viz.* Chriſt Jeſus, who is ſo often in Scripture called *The Rock or foundation ſtone of Sion*: but Pope-like, think its meant of *Peter*. And are there not many Propheſies, and much of the Revelation which is yet a ſealed myſterie to you? and *John* ſaith expreſly, *Rev.* 5. that the Scripture, *viz.* Chriſt the myſterie of God in Scripture, *is a ſealed book, that none could open it but the Lion of the Tribe of Judah.* Yet you ſay, that a natural man can do it. I leave it to the Reader to judge of the truth of this.

And 3. Whereas you ſay, if the Spirits work be to teach men the ſenſe of Scripture, it is to make them Notioniſts.

I anſwer firſt, then upon your own account, your humane Learning doth but make you Notioniſts; for you ſay, that helps you to the knowledge of the ſenſe of Scripture: Its no wonder then that you are ſo far from the power of truth; for you confeſs, that with all your learning you are but Notioniſts at the beſt; and truly you are but bad Notioniſts neither; for there is much of the ſenſe of Scripture that you are not acquainted withall.

You ſay, *Knowledge puffeth up.*

Anſw. True, fleſhly knowledge, ſuch as you are pleading for, but not

not the true saving knowledge of the Spirit of Christ; for the Scripture saith expressly, *That without knowledge the heart cannot be good; and for want of knowledge the people perish: And that its life eternal to know God, and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent:* and the more a soul knows of God and Christ, of God in Christ, the more he comes to abbor himself, *Isa.6. Act 9.*

And whereas you are so much upon this, *That the Scripture expressions are plain, and express their own meaning*, page 137. *Else they cannot be a perfect rule; and if men must understand them by or in the light or teaching of the Spirit, what were this but to make the Scripture a nose of Wax, as the Papists do, plyable to any sense, &c.*

Answ. 1. Its true, the Scripture expressions are plain, and express their own meaning: yet not so plain as you pretend, that every one may attain the sense of them; for you confess, that there is need of means and help to understand them. Then I querie which is the likeliest means to help us to understand the meaning of the Scripture, in comparing Scripture with Scripture; the Spirit of Christ, or humane Learning? Who best knows the meaning of the Scripture? that Spirit by which it was given, or that humane spirit so much pleaded for, that never did, nor never shall know the Lord?

2. The Scriptures are no perfect rule to ignorant and carnal men, or hypocrites: its a perfect rule only to such who by them know the Lord and his mind by the teachings of the Spirit, and so walk according to it; for if it be a perfect rule, then its so to those who know it.

You say a naturall man may know it; then a naturall man may have a perfect rule; and if he walk according to it, he must be saved; for who so walks by a perfect rule, and answers it in his walking, must be justified by that rule: Now the Scripture is no perfect rule of justification of life to any but the Saints; not that there is imperfection in the Scripture; but none comes truly to know it, but those who are taught from above.

3. To say, that the knowledge of the mind of God in Scripture, by the teachings of the Spirit, *is to make it a nose of Wax, &c.* is a fond imagination. For first, though its true, upon this account men that have not the Spirit of God may abuse it, thinking they have the Spirit of Christ, when they have it not.

Yet 2. The Spirit is truth, and is at unity in and with it self, and speaks but one thing: I mean he doth not contradict himself: though there are contradictions amongst the Saints: yet it is not from the

Spirit, who dwels in unity, but from the worldly ſpirit not yet ſubdued in them; and I thought you had known at leaſt the Scripture Zeph.3.9 that ſaith, *God will turn to his people a pure language, that they may ſerve him with one conſent*; its not the work of fleſhes wiſdom; but *I will do it*, ſaith the Lord; and how think you, if not in helping them to know his mind? &c.

And 2. Doth not your humane wiſdom indeed *make a noſe of wax of the Scripture*? do you not wreſt it and turn it which way you pleaſe? and is it not for want of the clear teachings of the Spirit, there are ſuch rentings and diviſions amongſt us at this day? Is it not about the ſenſe of the Scriptures all the differences in the world are at this day? And do you ſeek to God to guide you into a oneneſs in the underſtanding of the meaning of it, or to your humane Learning?

Oh be aſhamed for ever, ſo much to undervalue Scripture, and overvalue mans wiſdom, as that its ſufficient to find out the meaning of the Scriptures. When you have joyned up all together, yet notwithſtanding all your Learning, yea, and the Spirits teaching too, you have not yet attained to all the ſenſe of the Scriptures; if you had, there would not be diviſion, but unity; not that I queſtion the ſufficiency of the Spirits teaching in its own time; but certainly you are very much to blame, having gotten that which is able to teach you the ſenſe and meaning of the Scripture, with your own endeavour, yet to know ſo little of it as you do; you muſt needs be very ſluggards, or elſe able to reſolve (infallibly) any place of Scripture, you having that which is able, as you ſay, to help you to underſtand it, and you think you have the Spirit of Chriſt beſides; theſe two being by you joyned up together in you, the leaſt of which is able to help you to the infallible ſenſe, &c. What then hinders that you are not infallible? and yet that you are not infallible, is clear; for what need a difference then between *Papiſt* and *Proteſtant*, yet both Learned? between *Epiſcopacie* and *Presbyterie*, yet both Learned? *Presbyterie* and *Independency*, yet both Learned? *Independency* and the *Baptiſts*, yet ſome of both Learned? between them all, and thoſe that deny both Church and Ordinances, yet ſome of them Learned too?

Oh be aſhamed for ever of theſe Fopperies, and let all who know the Lord, look to him for the teachings of the Spirit, that ſo we may come to know his minde and will, that ſo we may worſhip him with one ſhoulder; and let all that love the Lord *Jeſus* ſay *Amen*. This ſhall ſuffice at preſent as an anſwer to what you ſay of your humanity.

manity. I deny not the uſe of means, but the abuſe of it. I leave it to the Reader to judge.

You come to the 8. Error.

That the Miniſtry of England *is Antichriſtian.*

Anſw. This is a dangerous one with you it ſeems; but becauſe I have ſaid ſo much to this in the *Pulpit Guard Routed*, I ſhall wholly wave it in this place, leaving both *Tho. Halls* aſſertions, my anſwers to him and yours again to mine, to the judgment of the Reader; a word to the wiſe is enough; its a word that you cannot yet well bear, therefore I ſhall at preſent forbear; only give me leave to minde you with two words, 1. You anſwer but one of my ſix Arguments to prove them *Antichriſtian*; the reſt you paſs by, as if the naming of them (as *Tho. Hall* ſaid) in contempt, were anſwer enough to them; if it be, I leave it to the Reader, I am ſatisfied. 2. In that which you pretend to anſwer, what do you more or leſs, then ſay the ſame that I have ſaid? You confeſs, 1. It came from *Rome*; but you think to mend it with this, becauſe the Scriptures came from *Rome*; but if by the hand of Gods grace the Scripture was kept pure in *Rome* and not defiled, then the caſe is altered; but they were ſo kept. *Ergo:* that it is ſo, I prove;

If the Scriptures preſerved by the Romans, *have ſufficient in them to overturn the very practiſe and Religion of the* Romans: *then they had not a power to corrupt it for their own ends.*

But the Scriptures preſerved by the Romans, *have ſufficient in them to overturn all the Religion of the* Romans, viz. *Papiſts.*

Ergo.

The *Minor* I prove. Thoſe who uſe to corrupt Scripture, do it for their own ends and intereſts; but the Papiſts have not corrupted it for their own ends and intereſts: *Ergo.* I mean in the *Hebrew*, and *Greek*, which I ſuppoſe muſt neceſſarily be that which you intend; for you ſay the Scriptures as well as Ordination, was very much corrupted by the Papiſts, *p* 169. but among us hath been reſtored by degrees; now our Work hath not been to reſtore the Popiſh Tranſlators, but to Tranſlate out of the *Greek* and *Hebrew* Copies, which I do not believe were, or are materially or ſubſtantially corrupted; ſo that by this you teach the People to deny the Scripture; and at beſt to take it upon the account of man reducing it from corruption. I muſt

tell you if the *Collier* had written as much, as black as you make him, he must have expected to have had all the black-Coats in the Nation about his ears, and that justly too.

So that the Case is altered now; the Scripture in its essence was kept pure; but the very essence of Ordination was *Antichristian*; and how you could bring a clean thing out of an unclean, I leave to the Reader to judge. As to the Argument, you confess the truth of it, that the Calling came from *Rome*, but you restore it by degrees: Now which is better, to come to the Scripture for Ordination, Ordinances, &c. or to retain that which is *Antichristian*: I leave to the Reader to judge; as for *Austin* the Monk, you confess what I say; only you think you mend the matter, in saying that Monks were not so bad then as now, and that *Rome* was a true Church then; the truth of this I leave to the judgement of the wise; these things considered;

1. When *Austin* came into *England*, here was some that owned *Christ*, as History relates; for as you say the Gospel had been preached in *England* before both by *Joseph* of *Arimathea*, and afterward *Lucius* King of the *Britains* desiring it, not *Elutherius* as you affirm, but *Fugatius* and *Damianus* being sent by *Elutherius* Pope or Bishop of *Rome*, they Preached and Baptized in *England*, that King being the first King that History mentions that was Baptized in *England*; but when *Austin* came, those Bishops you mention with the People, because they would not submit to the pride of *Austin*, were by him persecuted, and brought to ruine: by this you may judge a little of the truth of *Romes* being a true Church, and *Austin* a true Minister.

2. Whereas you say, *You hope Rome was then a true Church.* I say, you have but little ground for it; for I do not believe that ever *Rome* was a true Church. My Reason is, because I do judge, that never a Nation, Province or City, was a true Gospel-Church; its true there was once a true Church in *Rome*, but the Scripture never calls *Rome* a Church; for a true Church of *Christ* are a People gathered out of the world by the power of the Gospel, to believing in *Christ*, and professed obedience to him; but this was never any Nation, Province, or City; therefore no true Church of Christ, *Rev.* 5. 9 but such Churches were at first, and so it hath hitherto continued, gathered by the authority of the Civil Magistrate, compelling all to come in, or else they must not live under their Authority, fulfilling in a measure *Rev.* 13. 17. by which means the true Church in *Rome*, and all other true

true Churches, in Relation to Form, Order and Worſhip, have been extinguiſhed; ſo that I ſay, *Rome* was never a true Church ſince it became a Church, nor any Nation in the World beſides; its inconſiſtent with the true Church of Chriſt, who are a People gathered out of Nations, as before, &c.

But to draw to a concluſion; The other five Arguments you paſs ovr, as having no weight in them &c. I leave it to the Reader to judge, if there be no weight in them. I ſay no more, only a word to your Poſtſcript.

You ſay, *There is another dangerous peſtilent blaſphemous Book of this Colliers againſt Ordinances, &c. which you heard of, but never ſaw it.*

Anſw. I ſuppoſe you did but dream a ſecond time, and this proves falſe too; give off dreaming or lying for ſhame; for I ſuppoſe none dare lye ſo groſly as to tell you ſo, though you dare dream a lye and publiſh it; but there is a hand of God in it, that the world may know what you are. My Books are not in private; if there were any ſuch, it might be gotten aſſuredly; let this ſatisfie, I do declare that I never writ any ſuch Book; and if any have done or do gather from any paſſage that I deny Ordinances; though I know no paſſage in any, from whence any can draw ſuch a poſitive concluſion: I do affirm, that I never writ any thing in which I denyed the Ordinances of *Jeſus Chriſt*; and it is my judgement and practiſe to walk in the uſe of them. Thus at preſent have I done, leaving the Premiſes to the publick view and cenſure of thoſe to whom it comes, deſiring the Lord to give underſtanding, &c.

FINIS.

Some few Proposals to the Honorable *Committee* for *Propagation of the Gospel.*

Honoured Sirs,

GOD having been pleased to bring us forth in such an Age of the world, wherein we have seen, through mercy, not only his work of power in dethroning of unrighteous men; but likewise in a measure the arising of the Son of Righteousness with *healing in his wings*; and, I trust, *to take to himself his great Kingdom, and to reign.*

The business committed to you (by and next to the Supreme Authority of the Nation) being of very great concernment, and indeed that which relates to him who is the most Supreme, He who is *Lord of Lords, and King of Kings:* Notwithstanding I find there have been many Proposals unto your Honours, it might be altogether needless for such a one as I to propose any thing unto your Wisdoms; yet not doubting your willingness to hear what the weakest may propound in this great business, *though by it nothing be added to you*; I providentially and occasionally coming to this City, could not with good conscience depart from hence without presenting something unto your Honours, as to the thing in hand. If in it, to you or any others, I do appear *a fool*, let me be excused; I have performed in this my duty both to my Lord and you. My desire is, that the former presidents of miscarriages in changing times, may be a warning unto us, *viz.* The plucking up of one Form, and planting of another by the Magisterial power. *Every plant that the Heavenly Father hath not planted, must be plucked up.* My desire is, not to be tedious: but in a word, out of tenderness to the honour of the Lord Jesus, and the Authority of the Nation, that there may be given to *GOD* those things that are his, and to *Cæsar* those things that are his, have I humbly presented these following Proposals unto your Honours.

1. *Whether or no* Jesus Christ *be not the alone Spiritual King in and over all Cases of Conscience relating to Worship?* Psal. 2. Rev. 15. 3, 4. Act. 3. 22, 23. Mat. 28. 18.

2. *Whether he hath surrendred up any part of this Authority to any Civil Magistrate under the Gospel?* Jam. 4. 11, 12. Rom. 14. 4.

3. *Whether, because the* Jewish *Magistracie, according to the command of God, took cognisance of such things, they with all the rest of their Ordinances being typical in their anointing, power and rule, &c. it being all swallowed up into Christ the substance, he being the alone King of his people; be any ground for Magistrates now to do the like?*

4. *Whether to do the like, be not to deny Christ to be come in the flesh, and to deny his Kingly Authority?*

5. *Whether the work of the Magistrate, as a Magistrate, do not primely relate to the bodies of men, and things of this world; that so they may be for the praise of them that do well, and for the punishment of evil doers?* Rom. 13.

6. *Whether it be not the work whereunto God hath called them, to protect all that live peaceably and civilly, in obedience to the Civil Law of the Nation; and to encourage and protect the Servants of the Lord alike, in the Preaching and professing the Gospel, though differing in their apprehensions; leaving the judgment of Cases of Conscience unto Christ, as before?*

7. *Whether a State-maintenance for the Ministery of Christ, be agreeable to any Rule in the Gospel?*

8. *Whether*

8. *VVhether it hath not been, and is a way to make men rather State-Miniſters, then Chriſts Miniſters?*

9. *VVhether this hath not proved diſhonorable to Ieſus Chriſt and the Truth, having drawn ſo many into the worldly Miniſtery for love of gain?*

10. *VVhether it be not the duty of the Magiſtrate to permit the* Jews, *whoſe Converſion is promiſed, and we pretend to expect it, to live peaceably amongſt us?*

FINIS.